



This is a digital copy of a book that was preserved for generations on library shelves before it was carefully scanned by Google as part of a project to make the world's books discoverable online.

It has survived long enough for the copyright to expire and the book to enter the public domain. A public domain book is one that was never subject to copyright or whose legal copyright term has expired. Whether a book is in the public domain may vary country to country. Public domain books are our gateways to the past, representing a wealth of history, culture and knowledge that's often difficult to discover.

Marks, notations and other marginalia present in the original volume will appear in this file - a reminder of this book's long journey from the publisher to a library and finally to you.

Usage guidelines

Google is proud to partner with libraries to digitize public domain materials and make them widely accessible. Public domain books belong to the public and we are merely their custodians. Nevertheless, this work is expensive, so in order to keep providing this resource, we have taken steps to prevent abuse by commercial parties, including placing technical restrictions on automated querying.

We also ask that you:

- + *Make non-commercial use of the files* We designed Google Book Search for use by individuals, and we request that you use these files for personal, non-commercial purposes.
- + *Refrain from automated querying* Do not send automated queries of any sort to Google's system: If you are conducting research on machine translation, optical character recognition or other areas where access to a large amount of text is helpful, please contact us. We encourage the use of public domain materials for these purposes and may be able to help.
- + *Maintain attribution* The Google "watermark" you see on each file is essential for informing people about this project and helping them find additional materials through Google Book Search. Please do not remove it.
- + *Keep it legal* Whatever your use, remember that you are responsible for ensuring that what you are doing is legal. Do not assume that just because we believe a book is in the public domain for users in the United States, that the work is also in the public domain for users in other countries. Whether a book is still in copyright varies from country to country, and we can't offer guidance on whether any specific use of any specific book is allowed. Please do not assume that a book's appearance in Google Book Search means it can be used in any manner anywhere in the world. Copyright infringement liability can be quite severe.

About Google Book Search

Google's mission is to organize the world's information and to make it universally accessible and useful. Google Book Search helps readers discover the world's books while helping authors and publishers reach new audiences. You can search through the full text of this book on the web at <http://books.google.com/>

Pen. 971 c. $\frac{44}{N.s. 39}$

THE
CHRISTIAN
REMEMBRANCE.

A
Quarterly Review.

VOL. XXXIX.
JANUARY—JUNE.

LONDON:
PUBLISHED BY J. & C. MOZLEY,
6, PATERNOSTER ROW;
AND D. APPLETON & CO. 348, BROADWAY, NEW YORK.

1860.

LONDON :
R. CLAY, PRINTER, BREAD STREET HILL.

CONTENTS

OF

No. CVII.

	PAGE
ART. I.—1. Quakerism Past and Present. The First Prize Essay. By John Stephenson Rowntree.	
2. The Peculium ; An Endeavour to throw Light on some of the Causes of the Decline of the Society of Friends. By Thomas Hancock	1
II.—1. Collections of the Massachusetts Historical Society. First, Second, and Third Series.	
2. The Virginians. By W. M. Thackeray.	
3. Life of George Washington. By Washington Irving.	
4. Mary Howitt's History of the United States of America	48
III.—1. London Union on Church Matters. Annual Report, 1858.	
2. Society for the Revival of Convocation. Annual Report, 1858.	
3. Ecclesiological Society. Annual Report, 1859 ..	80
IV.—1. Missale Ambrosianum, novissime Joseph Cardinalis Puteobonelli, Archiepiscopi, auctoritate recognitum..	
2. Missale Ambrosianum, Caroli Cajetani Cardinalis de Gaisruck, Archiepiscopi, auctoritate recognitum. Novissime impressum	135
NO. CVII.—N.S.	

	PAGE
ART. V.—L'Union Chrétienne. Journal Hebdomadaire, paraissant tous les Dimanches	166
VI.—1. Realities of Paris Life.	
2. Flemish Interiors.	
3. A Glance behind the Grilles of Religious Houses	177
VII.—1. Journal of Convocation. 1854—1858.	
2. Liturgical Revision. By the Rev. C. H. Davis. With an Introduction by Lord Ebury.	
3. Church Questions. By the Rev. C. Robinson, LL.D.	208
NOTICES OF BOOKS	230

TITLE-PAGE AND INDEX TO VOL. XXXVIII.

CONTENTS

OF

No. CVIII.

	PAGE
ART. I.—1. Bacon's Essays, with Annotations. By Richard Whately, D.D. Archbishop of Dublin. Fourth Edition, revised and enlarged.	
2. Examen de la Philosophie de Bacon. Ouvrage Posthume du Comte Joseph de Maistre. Troisième Edition	239
II.—A Commentary on the Psalms from Primitive and Mediæval Writers : and from the various Office Books and Hymns of the Roman, Mozarabic, Ambrosian, Gallican, Greek, Coptic, Armenian, and Syriac Rites. By the Rev. J. M. Neale, M.A. Warden of Sackville College. Vol. I. Psalm I. to Psalm XXXVIII.	264
III.—1. What is Revelation ? A Series of Sermons on the Epiphany ; to which are added, Letters to a Student of Theology on the Bampton Lectures of Mr. Mansel. By the Rev. Frederick Denison Maurice, M.A. Chaplain of Lincoln's Inn.	
2. A Letter to the Reverend F. D. Maurice, on some Points suggested by his recent Criticism of Mr. Mansel's Bampton Lectures. By the Rev. C. P. Chretien, M.A. Fellow and Tutor of Oriel College, Oxford.	
3. An Examination of the Rev. F. D. Maurice's Strictures on the Bampton Lectures of 1858. By the Lecturer	283
IV.—Life of Bishop Wilson. By the Rev. Josiah Bate- man. 2 vols.	313
O. CVIII.—N.S.	

	PAGE
ART. V.—1. A Review of the Ulster Revival in the year 1859. By the Rev. Richard Oulton, Jun. A.M. Perpetual Curate of Altedesart, Diocese of Armagh.	
2. The Journal of Mental Science. Articles :— The Work and the Counter-work. By Edward A. Stopford, Archdeacon of Meath. Ulster Revivalism ; a Retrospect. By the Rev. W. M'Ilwaine, A.M. January, 1860.	
3. The Revival. By W. M. Wilkinson.	
4. Revivalism Reviewed. By the Rev. W. M'Ilwaine, A.M.	
5. Speech of Rev. W. M'Ilwaine, at Belfast Conference of Evangelical Alliance.	
6. God's Work and Satan's Counterwork. By the Rev. E. Hincks, D.D. Rector of Killyleagh	364
 VI.—1. Ueber die Ueberreste der Altbabylonischen Literatur in Arabischen Uebersetzungen von D. Chwolson.	
2. On the Remains of Old Babylonian Literature in Arabic Translations. By D. Chwolson	417
 VII.—Addresses to the Candidates for Ordination, on the Questions in the Ordination Service. By Samuel, Lord Bishop of Oxford	454
 VIII.—The Trial of the Bishop of Brechin. The Daily Courant, for March 15, 16, 17, 1860.....	474
 IX.—Codex Liturgicus Ecclesiæ Orientalia. Curavit Herm. Adalb. Daniel	479
NOTICES OF BOOKS	492

THE
CHRISTIAN REMEMBRANCER.

JANUARY, 1860.

ART. I.—*Quakerism, Past and Present. The First Prize Essay.*
By JOHN STEPHENSON ROWNTREE. London: Smith, Elder
& Co.

2. *The Peculium: an endeavour to throw light on some of the
Causes of the Decline of the Society of Friends.* By THOMAS
HANCOCK. London: Smith, Elder, & Co.

WE once heard a young lady ask an old F.R.S. ‘Why did Newton’s apple fall?’ and the old gentleman, with becoming gravity, replied, ‘Because it could not help it.’ The answer appeared to be quite satisfactory on that occasion; and we think it might be so on the present. We do not mean to say that the cause, and nature, and extent of the decadence of Quakerism should not be most carefully investigated by persons concerned in the matter; but we take leave to suggest that the inquiry should be carried on by Friends themselves; and, if it can be managed, at silent meetings. We suggest this without any feeling of unkindness, or any intention to disparage the members of the Society of Friends, many of whom have, in various ways, established claims to our respect. All we mean—and we wish to express it as strongly and plainly as possible—is, that the question why Quakerism has declined, and how it may be revived? is hardly worth discussing; because it seems quite certain that the sect can never be restored to any one of the states or positions in which it has heretofore existed, but must go on growing more and more into a conformity with the manners and habits of general society in whatever part of Christendom its tent may be pitched.

The phenomena of decadence have long been obvious. Several years have passed since a writer of the present day remarked that ‘even common observers must have noticed that, for a long time past, Quakers have been quietly getting more like other people. Broad-brims have been shrinking; while, as if in compensation, other parts of dress have crept down to the

'ankles; drab coats have darkened into something almost as dark and worldly as mourning; silk gowns have bloomed into plum-colour; and bonnets, if not actually in flower, exhibit a growing vivacity of form and colour which promises a sprightly development of some sort: children are in a transition state which excites compassion.'

Things have not, however, advanced so rapidly as was expected when these words were written. They referred to some articles in *The Friend*, which is, or was, a monthly publication, describing itself as a religious and literary journal for the Society of Friends. The very first article of correspondence in the number for 1st month, 1853, is headed, in large capitals, with three notes of admiration. 'Quaker Brothers in Mourning for the Duke of Wellington!!!' That such a thing should be at all, and still more that it should be thus told in Gath, were novelties; and it seemed hard to say whether the juvenile depravity in crape, or the frank publication of it by 'Senex,' was the more portentous. His letter, however, respecting these young offenders gave rise to a good deal of discussion in succeeding numbers of the *Friend*, in which it was seriously and freely debated whether 'the peculiarities' were not, after all, things which it would be rather better to be rid of. One writer went so far as to say, 'These distinctions have the effect of needlessly separating us from other Christian believers, operate as a burlesque on religion itself, and prejudice the irreligious against it;' while another more clearly indicates where the shoe pinches by saying, 'It must be evident to the most common observer that our young men are increasingly disposed to lay aside the peculiarity of dress.' This, no doubt, is true, and only what might be expected. Hats and coats, bonnets and caps, of a quaint demonstrative cut, are letters-patent addressed to the world at large; and they form a public testimony which, some for one reason, and some for another, are not anxious at all times and in all places to force on the notice of those who may be inclined to make fun of them. Dress, however, though it has always been a difficult matter to deal with, and one that has, no doubt, greatly contributed to the decadence of the sect, is, after all, a secondary matter, and we must not exaggerate its influence. There are other causes equally obvious and more powerful. It may suffice, for the present, to mention one.

George Fox tells us in his 'Journal' that 'there was one Hewes, of Plymouth, a priest of great note in Oliver's days, who, when some liberty was granted, prayed "That God would put it into the hearts of the chief magistrates of the nation to remove this cursed toleration;" and others of

'them prayed against it by the name of "Intolerable Toleration."¹ There is a sense in which the founder of Quakerism, if he had been a far-sighted man, might have adopted this language; for to sectarianism, toleration is of all things 'most tolerable and not to be endured.' But if Fox did not foresee the fortune of his followers, his friend, George Whitehead, long afterwards, looked back and confessed that 'The persecution 'time was a seed time for the truth and Gospel of Jesus Christ;' and that while it lasted, 'the faithful grew and multiplied.' Intolerance might be oppressive to individuals; but as to the sect, '*premedo sustulit*.' There was some life in the thing when men might fairly count upon kicks and cuffs, and worse consequences, for little oddities which their neighbours, as foolish as themselves, took in dudgeon. This 'Thou and Thee,' says George Fox, 'was a sore cut to proud flesh;' and it was something to be able to add, 'so that we were often beaten and 'abused, and sometimes in danger of our lives, for using those 'words to some proud men.' This was much; and it was more still to launch those 'peculiarities' from beneath a beaver which racks and tortures, and Archimedes himself, might have tried in vain to move. But to have such 'testimonies' kindly overlooked, and politely unnoticed, is poor work. The play, be it tragedy or comedy, is not worth keeping up when the spectators no longer heed the performance, and the actors are more than half ashamed of it.

In fact, as it regards some of its essentials and fundamentals, Quakerism is already extinct. It has little or nothing to say on what were once its great points,—so great, and so earnestly pressed, as to extort respect for men, and even women, who were unwise and misguided. Quakers are no longer wild, perhaps naked, fanatics rushing through the streets, and into steeple-houses, to proclaim judgments on the land, the overthrow of all churches and governments, and the end of the world. No longer are they enthusiastic missionaries forcing their way to Pope and Turk, Jew and Infidel; and found up and down the wide world in such odd places and predicaments as to be mistaken (if it always was a mistake) for spies and political agents. No voice like William Penn's now breaks the silence of their meetings with triumphant assurance that God will 'daily bring forth, by his eternal arm, many noble 'champions for his glory, who shall sound forth his wonders to 'the ends of the earth, and stand as Saviours (upon Mount 'Zion) to the nations. And, therefore, woes to the dark, 'hellish, sin-pleasing, persecuting priests, professors, and pro-

¹ P. 240.

² Christian Progress, p. 631.

³ Jour. p. 245.

'phane of the whole earth; for the Lord God Omnipotent is taking to Himself his great power, and He will reign whose kingdom stands in righteousness, and is an everlasting kingdom, and of whose government and dominion there shall be 'no end.'

And while their higher and greater thoughts have perished—while the weightier matters of their law have been suffered to pass out of mind—their social oddities, consisting chiefly of quaint dress, bad grammar, and little rudenesses in speech and behaviour, which would be unpleasant from sensible men if we did not know that it was only their way, have arrived at the dignity of being called 'THE PECULIARITIES'—as if (to say nothing of things still stranger, and less pardonable) it was not a more notable peculiarity in Mary Fisher to make her own way, all by herself, to the Sultan's camp at Adrianople, and have a long talk with him, than it would have been to stay at home in a starched cap, saying 'thou sees' and 'thee knows' to her neighbours.

At the same time, it must be observed, that the maintenance of the puny peculiarities which survive has been a matter of great difficulty to the sect. Friends have found the gnats harder to deal with than the camels. The complaint has always been against the young from the days of Fox to those of Thomas Story and Sarah Grubb, and from their days to our own.

It is natural that such a movement should come from the younger portion of any community; but there is in this case a peculiar and, we may say, retributive propriety not obvious to those who have not looked into the origin and early history of Quakerism. Friends tell us triumphantly—even one of those correspondents of the *Friend* does so—of 'a Fox, a Penn, and a Barclay.' Whenever old times are talked of, these, and other ancients of the heroic age of Quakerism, bear down upon us under an impenetrable *testudo* of broad beavers, all and each, we are to suppose, covering the silver locks of age and experience guided by 'best wisdom.' Like Shrewsbury, which, in its Mayor's estimation, had always been an ancient town, they are only thought of as veterans. Their names call up the idea of demure elders; and one cannot imagine that they ever were young. It is, however, certain, and the fact is very well worth notice, that whatever may be the merits or the demerits of the sect, either as it was or as it is, it was originally founded, and was kept up during its heroic age, by men who had not arrived, if they ever did arrive, at years of discretion.

¹ Testim. to Cole, in Cole's Works, p. 19.

Our attention was accidentally called to this fact by the review of Tuke's 'Memoirs of George Whitehead' in the *Friend's Magazine*,¹ 1830; in which the reviewer says, 'We are forcibly struck with a few particulars. GEORGE WHITEHEAD was a very useful member of the Society at an early period of his life: in the year 1661, when only twenty-four years of age, he pleaded the cause of his friends at the bar of the House of Commons.' No doubt he did; we have his own account of it in his autobiography, which was published under the title of 'The Christian Progress of that *Ancient* Servant and Minister of Christ, George Whitehead.' We mark the word 'ancient,' though it was used with great propriety after the subject of the memoir had been for some years a subject of King George; but with regard to this early exploit he tells us, 'As we were upon withdrawing out of the House, some of the members near the door gently pulled me by my coat-sleeve; I turned and asked them, "What they would have with me?" They said, "Nothing, but to look upon you:" I being but a young man, about twenty-four years of age.' He had, however, been imprisoned for preaching when 'so young as but about eighteen years old;' and for the purpose of our inquiry we must go still farther back. He says, 'Being partly educated under a Presbyterian ministry, which the Lord shewed me in divers things came short of what they professed and pretended in their worships, preachings, and prayings; insomuch that (before I heard of the people called Quakers) I could not cordially joyn with them; and being at a loss in my spirit, for what I sometimes secretly desired and wanted, I was as one bewildered, and wandered farther, seeking among other people who had some higher and more refined notions concerning spiritual gifts, &c. I was then about *fourteen* years of age. After a short time I heard of some people called Quakers, &c.

Poor lad, surely he was startled when, after his long and anxious search, 'Quod Petis' announced himself in so quaint a form; but the reader will see, by the few specimens that fall in our way, that this was a time when there were always multitudes of men, women, and even children, who had been driven to and fro, and tossed up and down, until, according to their several temperaments and circumstances, they were ready to entertain any novelty that promised to relieve their mental exhaustion, by either repose or excitement.

The reviewer very justly adds—'In respect to his youthful

¹ Eighth month, 1830, p. 600.

² Ibid. p. 35.

³ Chr. Pr. p. 270.

⁴ Ibid. p. i.

'services he was on a footing with many of his contemporaries and fellow-ministers of the Gospel; . . . conspicuous services were performed by many of our honourable predecessors almost before they had arrived at mature age.' He then proceeds to mention several instances which are well worth attention, and which we shall take the liberty to confirm by a few bracketed interpolations as we quote them:—

'JAMES PARNALL' [of whom the first sentence in the preface to Callaway's memoir of him, published in 1846, tells us that 'at the early age of sixteen' he 'was made an able minister of the Gospel,'] 'died a martyr in Colchester Castle at the age of twenty.' [A. D. 1656.]

'WILLIAM PENN wrote his "No Cross no Crown" when confined in the Tower of London, at the age of twenty-four;' [and says, moreover, in the account of his visit to the celebrated 'Ancient Maid,' Anna Maria Schurman, and her friends, 'I began to let them know how, and when the Lord first appeared unto me, which was about the twelfth year of my age, anno 1656. How at times, betwixt that and the fifteenth, the Lord visited me, and the divine impressions He gave me of Himself: of my persecution at Oxford, and how the Lord sustained me in the midst of that hellish darkness and debauchery: of my being banish'd the college; the bitter usage I underwent when I returned to my father; whipping, beating, and turning out of doors, in 1662,'¹ when he was about eighteen years of age.]

'ROBERT BARCLAY' ['having,' according to Sewel, 'attained the age of nineteen years, and being come to a good maturity of understanding,' embraced Quakerism, and] 'had composed his able Apology before he was twenty-eight; and

'JOHN AUDLAND' ['a young man,' says Sewel, 'of a comely countenance, and very lovely qualities. When he was but seventeen or eighteen years old he was very religious, and a zealous searcher of the Holy Scriptures; and having a good understanding, and strong memory, he thereby gathered a large treasure of Scripture learning, became an eminent teacher amongst the Independents, and had a very numerous auditory.' He went, however, to hear George Fox in 1652, and was 'quite brought over by his effectual preaching,' and it was 'not long' before he became one of the 'publishers of that doctrine' which he had thus embraced.² His precise age does not appear; but no doubt the reviewer is quite right in saying that he] 'and

¹ Life prefixed to his Works, vol. i. p. 92.

² History of the Quakers, p. 472.

³ Ibid. p. 54.

'EDWARD BURROUGH travelled much as ministers when very young, and the latter died a prisoner before he had completed 'his twenty-ninth year.' ['By his parents,' says Sewel, 'he was trained up in the episcopal worship; yet when but twelve years of age, he often went to the meeting of the Presbyterians, because their doctrine in many things seemed to him to approach nearer to truth than that of the publick Church; wherefore he became a follower of the Presbyterians.'] After a time he heard George Fox in Westmoreland, and 'about the nineteenth year of his age he first came to London with a publick testimony.'¹]

These, as we have stated, are merely the names which the reviewer mentions in proof of his position, that his 'honorable predecessors' had performed 'conspicuous services' for Quakerism, 'almost before they had arrived at mature age.' He might have added others, probably several, beside two or three which we will briefly mention.

First, there was Edward Burrough's convert, THOMAS ELWOOD, who tells us in his amusing Memoirs, 'Few boys in the school wore out more birch than I. For though I was never, that I remember, whipped upon the score of not having my lesson ready, or of not saying it well, yet being a little busy boy, full of spirit, of a working head and active hand, I could not easily conform myself to the grave and sober rules, and, as I then thought, severe orders of the school, but was often playing one waggish prank or other among my schoolfellows, which subjected me to correction, so that I have come under the discipline of the rod twice in a forenoon, which yet brake no bones.'² How old was he when he was 'reached'³ by Edward Burrough, whom, by the way, he describes as a 'brisk young man of a ready tongue'?⁴ It may be doubted whether Thomas Elwood was out of legal infancy when he published his 'Alarm to Priests,' and underwent cruel buffetings for denying 'hat honour' to his father.

On the authority of Sewel we may mention 'JOSIAH COALE, who likewise in his young years came over to the Quakers.'⁵ He is far too important a person to be passed over. William Penn has testified of him that he 'was dreadful in his testimony against the life, glory, and customes of the worlde. . . . His declaration was to the ungodly world like an ax, an hammer, or a sword, sharp and piercing, being mostly attended with an eminent appearance of the dreadful Power of the Lord, to the cutting down of many a tall cedar, to the making of many

¹ History of the Quakers, p. 55.

⁴ Ibid. p. 18.

⁵ Ibid. p. 17.

² Sewel, 876.

³ P. 7.

⁶ Hist. p. 474.

'lofty oaks to bow . . . but above all, terrible was he to
'the sowers of strife, secret backbiters, and such as rend the
'holy body, and separate from the life, love, and fellowship of
'the blessed truth; who in their own selfish spirit set them-
'selves over the holy brethren, by feignedness and deceitful
'appearances, to the betraying of the simple-hearted, and
'ketching the innocent in their snares.'¹ Alas! that there
should so soon have been need, in the infant Society of Friends,
for any one to do such work as Friend Coale did so terribly.

Among the Testimonials prefixed to the volume referred to,
there is one in verse. It consists of twenty-two couplets, and
as it immediately follows the Testimonial of George Fox, and
is signed M. F., it may be presumed that it was the contribution
of his wife Margaret. This, one of the earliest if not best of
Quaker poetesses, testifies:—

'His travels they were sore, within, and eke without:
His recompense was large; yes, there's no doubt.
Now he shines as a star, of no small magnitude,
Who, by the power of God, hath convinc'd a multitude.'

* * * * *

'He sweetly comforted the meek;
Ah, he was strength unto the weak;
But terrible he was to the stout-hearted,
Who verily was smote before they parted.'

The poetry may be nothing to speak of, but it was probably
the best that the poetess had to offer, and 'who would not sing
for Lycidas?' Josiah had been, perhaps, the first Quaker poet,
as well as the first who received a testimonial in verse. A few
of his 'Lines,' which were 'written in Bridewel, near Laneston
'in Cornwall, the 11th moneth, 1664, and sent to all sectaries
'(in Christendom who had been killing and destroying one
'another about faith and worship), but especially to the Church
'of Rome,'² may be quoted, not merely as a specimen of his
poetic powers, but as illustrating the idea which early Quakerism
had of its mission. It had not any Peace Society so compre-
hensive as to include 'peace with Rome;' and it has been
accused of something like going down to Egypt for help, and
confederating with Turks against Papists. It is to be hoped
that the story may not be true about 'John Filly [or Philly], a
'Kentish man, who, moved with zeal against Popery, came over
'to invite the Grand Seignior to invade Hungary, to extirpate
'it in the emperor's dominions;' but there are odd stories about
his goings on elsewhere, which make us a little suspicious.³

¹ Testimonial prefixed to 'The Books and divers Epistles' of Coale, p. 16.

² Works, p. 113.

³ See Bease's Sufferings, vol. ii. p. 420.

Josiah Coale, however, having declared that the day of vengeance against Babylon had arrived, went on,—

'The holy prophets in their day foretold these things of thee,
Which, to our consolation, we hope to live and see;
For Jeremiah he foresaw thy desolation great,
And said an army great should come that should give the defeat;
Out of the north the prophet said, they should come against thee
(Even as it is now come to pass), before whom thou must flee.'

The fact that Quakerism, after being born and bred in the north of England, had come southwards, was not unfrequently represented by members of the sect as a fulfilment of Jeremiah i. 9, 'I will raise and cause to come up against Babylon an assembly of great nations from the north country,' &c. A little farther on the poet says,—

'For th' day is dawn'd which John foresaw (and prophesy'd of thee),
In which he said, and testify'd, thy total fall should be.'

And after describing the conduct by which the Romish Church had shown itself to be the subject of the prediction, he adds,—

'And truly thy divisions great, predicts thy sudden fall,
The more, because thou hast refus'd to hear the heavenly call;
For in thy streets the voice hath cry'd, Repent and fear the Lord,
And turn from your idolatries, serve God with one accord;
But like the adder thou hast been, that's deaf, and will not hear
The charmer, who hath charmed long, so thou hast stop't thine ear.'

POOR JOHN PERROT, it is to be feared that Josiah Cole did not mean to include him among the charmers whose voices had been lifted up in the streets of the mystic Babylon, though 'John the Quaker, who went to Rome to convert the Pope,' is certainly the best known of them all; that is, so far as concerns the fact that he did go to Rome, and that the Pope put him in a madhouse. But probably few readers have suspected him of being hinted at as a 'sower of strife,' who, as we have just read in Penn's Testimonial, was addicted to 'ketching the innocent.' But so it was. Sewel tells us, that after his return from Rome he 'had so far complied with his vain imaginations, that he 'thought himself further enlightened than G. Fox and his 'friends,'¹ and made a party of his own. Fox was so shocked, that, as he tells us, he 'was moved to give forth a paper, 'declaring how the Lord would blast them all, both him and 'his followers (if they did not repent and return), and that 'they should wither, like the grass on the house-top: and 'so many of them did; but others of them returned and 'repented.'² John Perrot did neither the one nor the other; but being come into America, he fell into manifest sensualities

¹ Hist. p. 290.

² Journal, p. 241.

and works of the flesh: 'For he not only wore gawdy apparel, but also a sword, and being got into some place in the government, he became a severe exactor of oaths, whereas before he had profest that for conscience's sake he could not swear.'¹ It is due to John Perrot to say that we have never heard of any other 'sensualities;' and that it was not for 'sensualities' of any kind that he came under the excommunication of George Fox, but simply because he and his company, 'giving heed to a spirit of delusion, sought to introduce and set up among friends that evil and uncomely practice of keeping on the hat in time of publick prayers.'² There was a fearful strife about that; but our business at present is with the earlier days of John Perrot, and, repressing a wish to speak more fully even of them, we must make him the means of bringing us back to our point, by quoting his testimony as to the 'tenderness' of his youth when he entered on his labours.

In an 'Epistle,' which he wrote 'in Egrippo, in the island of Negroponte,' addressed 'to the Greeks, especially to those in and about Corinth and Athens,' he seems to acknowledge that some apology for his youth was not only due, but had been required by the grave and reverend seniors whom he was addressing, and whose religious services in their 'house of Rimmon,' he had been moved to attend 'on the 27 day of the 7 month in the year accounted 1657, being the first day of the week, the day of Greeks solemn worship.'³ 'Carlo Dessio, Gumeno Stephaci,' he exclaims, 'called Greek doctors of your people in the city of Athens, among whom I was conversant in the power of the Spirit of the Lord, and preached unto you the Everlasting Gospel, in crosse to your wisdomes, wherefore ye resisted my testimony, and called me fool, and said, all young men are fooles.'⁴ At the same time, John did not condescend to any apology beyond mere explanation. 'Ye know not,' said he, 'the right hand from the left, and therefore I write little things unto you, and do speak plain words concerning you . . . and therefore I further say, That it is not a shame unto you, whose long hairs declare seniority without, in the antiquity of your dayes, to stoop and bow your necks, for your backs to bear the chastisement of the rod of your younger in years; and know ye that it was prudence in as many of the aged, whose faces wore a fair show of grey hairs, not to despise the youth of tender Timothy.'⁵ And more than ten pages after, he again recurs to it, as if it had been rather a sore point: 'You doctors of Athens, remember

¹ Sewal, p. 290.⁴ Ibid. p. 21.² Fox's Journal, p. 248.⁵ Ibid. p. 24.³ P. 25.

' my rod . . . I have not forgotten the strength on which you took hold, which appeared and proved as a ravelled string of a broken bow, which could not carry forth so as to send home the shaft; you ayimed at my birth, to have trodden upon the simplicities and tendernesses of my youth,'¹ &c.

We hope it will not be thought that by thus insisting on the feature of juvenility we mean to maintain the opinion of the old gentlemen of Athens, that all young men are fools. At the same time, many respectable people have an impression that those who have not had even time for observation, experience, and reflection,—especially if they are untaught but prone to teach, impatient of restraint but forward to impose it,—are not the fittest persons to be entrusted with the business of forming, or reforming, churches.

But has it not struck the reader as a strange thing, that in reckoning up this list of youthful apostles, the reviewer whom we have quoted did not mention the name of George Fox? He reckons youthful apostles of twenty-four, twenty-eight, twenty-nine years of age—why, the father and founder of Quakerism had renounced home and kindred, and begun his career of independent action, by the time that he was about nineteen. To avoid a mistake which has been made before now, and to which this inquiry is peculiarly liable, it is right to mention that young 'George Fox' and 'George Fox the Younger,' though contemporary and eminent Quakers, were two very different persons. The exact age of the latter seems uncertain; but he had been in the army, and was the older man of the two; and only 'the younger' in Quakerism.

Unfortunately, the early history of George Fox (the real Simon Pure) is very little known. We have, it is true, his 'Journal,' which relates many of his proceedings very minutely; and appears to have been, in a great measure, made from notes taken soon after the occurrences which it records. At the same time it is obvious, that it does not tell us more than Fox himself meant to tell the public; and (what makes it worse) it seems pretty certain that it does not tell us so much. We have to consider, not only that he kept the manuscript Journal by him as long as he lived, and through great changes of men and things, and that all that time he could add or cancel what he pleased; but we must also bear in mind that when it came into the hands of his friends they took considerable pains, and great liberties, to make the Journal what they thought it ought to be, before it was printed.

A good deal might be said on this point, and on the variations

¹ Ibid. p. 35.

of different editions; but the discussion would be tedious. We will only suggest one thing which is not equally obvious, but which may be more or less important in estimating the authority of the work. Our observation of the matter was quite accidental; and whether the case is singular, or one of many, we do not know; but it is curious in itself, and it suggested the idea that, in the long period during which the Journal lay unpublished, some old stories may have lost their way; and some things done by others may have been, without intentional dishonesty, appropriated by, or assigned to, the Hercules of the sect. The fact is at all events worthy of notice. Under the year 1662, in Fox's Journal, we read:—'There were two ' of our friends in prison in the Inquisition at Malta; they ' were both women. The name of the one was Katharine ' Evans, and of the other Sarah Chevers. I was told that one, ' called the Lord d'Aubeny, could procure their liberty; where- ' fore I went to him: And having informed him concerning ' their imprisonment, desired him to write to the magistrates ' there for their release. He readily promised me he would; ' and said, If I would come again within a month, he would ' tell me of their discharge. I went again about that time; and ' he said he thought his letters had miscarried, because he had ' received no answer. But he promised he would write again; ' and he did so: and thereupon they were both set at liberty. ' With this great man I had a great deal of reasoning about ' religion,' &c.

This may be true. It is just possible that Fox may have interested himself in the matter as much as he states, without becoming aware that anybody else had done anything in it; but we cannot help suspecting that, intentionally or not, some injustice is done to friend Gilbert Latey, whom we have sincerely respected ever since we met with his address 'To all you Taylors and Brokers who lye in wickedness.' It is, indeed, singular that his name is not mentioned in the business; and only once, as far as we have observed, and that quite incidentally, in any part of Fox's Journal. Yet surely Fox must have known, and had to do with him. Not on account of his grey coat and leather breeches,³ nor perhaps in any way while

¹ Page 252. It is the more worth while to notice this, as the same account is given by Sewel, p. 293.

² See Hawkins's Brief Narrative of the Life and Death of that Ancient Servant of the Lord and his People, p. 86.

³ It is a matter of mere curiosity, but we should like to know on what authority J. H. (a correspondent in *The Friend* for 6th month, 1853, p. 105) says that George Fox 'constructed himself leathern garments.' As to the phraseology, a kindred, and more absurd, specimen may be found in the modern edition of the Journal, vol. ii. p. 46, where Thomas Ibbots' original 'britches' are changed

he had 'great reputation in the world' as a tailor, 'being 'employ'd and respected by persons of the first rank and 'quality,' but in later times. Who did not know that 'ancient friend and brother,' as George Whitehead calls him; adding that he had been his 'true companion in laborious solicitations 'in the late three kings' reigns.' He might have said, too, in the chat with Charles Stuart when he 'was very pleasant, and 'asked the Friends several questions, as why they could not as 'well say Ay and No, as Yea and Nay,' and went on to talk about 'Thee and Thou,' and 'hat honour.' And then, after the very questionable compliment, 'I admire to see such wise men Quakers,' Gilbert having 'asked if they might speak 'freely, for that they were in great hazard in approaching the 'King's presence,' his Majesty stretched out his hand and said, 'Let no man molest or meddle with them, but let them come to 'me when they have occasion.'

Whoever reads the Memoirs of this worthy man will find, and we think believe, a story how friend Latey heard of the imprisonment of these female friends, whom Fox represents as owing their deliverance to his own interference; and how he 'got information 'that one Lord Obaney, who came over with the Queen-mother, 'and was Lord Almoner to her, had both interest, power, and 'command in the island of Malta, which when Gilbert had 'gained the knowledge of, [he] soon found a necessity upon him 'to attend the Lord Obaney, and found him to be a well-'tempered man.'¹—how the Lord Obaney 'was very kind and 'free to Gilbert, and reasoned with him like Felix with Paul'—how they got to be so friendly and confidential that the Lord Obaney would needs have him into the Queen's chapel, 'where 'Gilbert, seeing the people on their knees, and the candles 'lighted on the altar, made a halt, and asked the Lord Obaney 'what he meant by bidding him come in there; "for," said he, "thou knowest I can bow to nothing;" upon which he answered, "Follow me, and nobody shall hurt you or meddle with you." Upon which Gilbert followed him through the chapel to 'a room behind the altar, where was another of the Queen's 'priests; and there being some lesser altars, the Lord Obaney 'said to Gilbert, "You never yet saw me in my priestly 'habit, but now you shall;" and whilst he was making ready, 'the Power of the Lord worked so much on Gilbert, that he 'stepped up on a place they called a private altar, and the word 'of the Lord came to him to preach truth unto them.'

into 'trousers'; keeping their strings at the knees. We do not know how far Mr. Armistead, who furnished the notes, is responsible for the foolish modernization of the text.

¹ Page 50, *et seq.*

This was certainly what might be considered as making himself at home; but it seems to have been well taken. 'Gilbert ceased not to visit the Lord Obaney,' till he learned that his friends in Malta were at liberty: 'and they some time after arrived in England, came to London, and went to visit Gilbert; and after acknowledging his love and endeavours for their liberty, desired him to bring them to the sight of the Lord Obaney.' Gilbert took them accordingly, and explained to my lord that they were the friends whom he had served, and that they 'were now come to pay their acknowledgments to him for the same; whereupon he asked if they were the women? To which they reply'd, They were; and according as the Lord put it into their hearts they spake to him;' [if we may judge of their speeches from their letters, at considerable length] 'adding, that were it in their power, they should be as ready in all love to serve him; upon which he reply'd, "Good women, for what service or kindness I have done you, all that I desire of you is, that when you pray to God, you will remember me in your prayers;" and so they parted.'

But to return to the subject of George Fox's Journal, from which we should not have suffered our really respected friend Gilbert Lathey to lead us so far, and keep us so long, but with a view to our main subject. Such as the Journal is we must take it, and make the best of it; and when we have done that we really know very little about George Fox's early history. 'As I grew up,' he says, 'my relations thought to have made me a priest, but others perswaded to the contrary.'¹ This is, perhaps, the only direct statement respecting what was probably a very important and influential matter. It may, possibly account (there seems to be nothing else that does) for his bitter hatred of the clergy, and for the tenor of some of the earliest revelations which he says that he received. In the meantime this project of the Church, and we presume a University education, being abandoned, he was 'put to a man, that was a shoo-maker by trade, and that dealt in wooll and went grazing, and sold cattel; and a great deal,' he says, 'used through my hands. While I was with him, he was blest; but after I left him, he broke, and came to nothing.'² At what age, or on what terms, he was put to this shoemaker we do not find; but he seems to have considered himself as pretty much his own master: for 'on the 9th day of the 7th month, 1643,' when he was about nineteen, 'at the command of God,' as he says, he left his relations, 'and brake off all familiarity or fellowship with young or old.' From that time

¹ Journal, p. 2.

² Ibid. p. 2.

he seems for some years to have led a rambling, solitary life. He says, 'Now, during all this time I was never joined in profession of religion with any, but gave up myself to the Lord; having forsaken all evil company, and taken leave of father and mother, and all other relations, and travelled up and down as a stranger in the earth, which way the Lord inclined my heart.'¹ On the next page he tells us, 'I was afraid of all company. . . . I had not fellowship with any people, priests, or professors, nor any sort of separated people: but with Christ, who hath the key, and opened the door of light and life unto me. And I was afraid of all carnal talk and talkers; for I could see nothing but corruptions, and the life lay under the burden of corruptions.'²

At some time during this period—apparently early in the year 1646—as he was walking in a field on a first day morning, he says, 'The Lord opened to me, "that being bred at Oxford or Cambridge was not enough to fit and qualifie men to be ministers of Christ."' He adds that he 'stranged at it because it was the common belief of the people. But I saw it clearly,' he goes on to say, 'as the Lord opened it to me, and was satisfied; and admired the goodness of the Lord, who had opened this thing unto me that morning: which struck at Priest Stevens [of Drayton, Fox's native place], his ministry, namely, that "To be bred at Oxford and Cambridge was not enough to make a man fit to be a minister of Christ." So that which opened in me, I saw, struck at the priest's ministry.' His next revelation appears to have been that 'God, who made the world, did not dwell in temples made with hands.' This, he says, 'opened in me, as I walked in the fields to my relation's house. And when I came there, they told me that Nath. Stevens, the priest, had been there, and told them, "He was afraid of me for going after new lights. And I smiled in myself, knowing what the Lord had opened in me concerning him and his brethren: But I told not my relations.'³

Thus the matter of the clergy and their churches was settled; but Fox does not seem to have considered himself as having received his commission to go forth into the world, and testify against it and its clergy until some time in the year 1648. Having stated that the Lord had said to him, 'Thy name is written in the Lamb's book of life, which was before the foundation of the world,' he proceeds, 'Then some time after the Lord commanded me to go abroad into the world, which was like a briary, thorny wilderness. And when I came in

¹ Journal, p. 7.

² Ibid. p. 8.

³ Ibid. p. 5.

⁴ Ibid. p. 6.

'the Lord's mighty power, with the word of life into the world, the world swelled, and made a noise, like the great raging waves of the sea. Priests and professors, magistrates and people were all like a sea, when I came to proclaim the day of the Lord amongst them, and to preach repentance to them.'¹

It would be tedious to enumerate the heavy and multifarious burdens which this unhappy young man had, or fancied he had, all at once, bound upon him. He was 'sorely exercised in going to their courts to cry for justice, and in speaking and writing to judges and justices to do justly.'—warning publicans not to 'let people have more drink than would do them good'—testifying against wakes, feasts, May-games, sports, plays, shows,—at fairs also and markets, to declare against deceitful merchandize, cheating and cozening—to cry against all sorts of music and mountebanks—he 'was much exercised too with school-masters and school-mistresses,' to prevent children from being 'nursed and trained up in lightness, vanity, and wantonness.' Likewise, he 'was made to warn masters and mistresses, fathers and mothers, in private families to take care that their children and servants might be trained up in the fear of the Lord, and that they should be therein examples and patterns of sobriety and virtue to them.' And he seems to have wound up the long list of his burdens, by telling us at the end of a paragraph, filling almost a folio page, that he was 'exercised about the star-gazers,'² &c.

'He seems,' we say—but he has only paused to take breath after this long list of duties, which we have unmercifully condensed; and he begins a fresh paragraph with a subject which seems to have lain nearer his heart than any of them. 'But,' he says—as if he were going to mention some further duty so burdensome as to present an obstacle to the performance of others—'But the black, earthly spirit of the priest wounded my life: And when I heard the bell toll, to call people together, to the steeple-house, it struck at my life:' [unhappy man, one expects him to go on with a lamentation that the Sabbath-bell was an invitation to hear, what he considered false doctrine, and heresy, from somebody whom he charitably assumed to be an ignorant and ungodly man: but no such thing. He proceeds:] 'For it was just like a market-bell, to gather people together that the priest might set forth his ware to sale. O the vast sums of money, that are gotten by the trade they make of selling the Scriptures, and by their preaching, from the highest bishop to the lowest priest. What one trade in the world else is comparable to it?'

¹ Journal, p. 22.

² Ibid. p. 25.

But over and above, and (in every sense of the word) beside, the performance of all these duties, Fox has stated in his Journal, that some other things were enjoined him which had more the character of 'peculiarities' than any of those which have just been specified, and which have ever since, even to the present day, formed the most obvious and well-known distinctions of his sect. There is no great peculiarity in not liking to pay parsons or tax-gatherers, or anybody else, more than one can help; and most of those who have peculiar objections to such money payments, may find peculiar methods of escape without attracting much attention. But there was something more in George Fox's case; we give his words with italics and capitals, as they stand in the original edition of his Journal:—

'Moreover, when the Lord sent me forth into the world, he forbade me *To put off my Hat* to any, *High or Low*. And I was required to *Thee and Thou* all Men and Women, without any respect to *Rich or Poor, Great or Small*. And as I traveled up and down, I was not to bid people *Good Morrow or Good Evening*; neither might I *Bow or Scrape with my Leg* to any one: And this made the Sects and Professions to rage.'

A pleasing and pious result; on which he seems to have looked back with great satisfaction, while he exclaims:—

'Oh! the Rage that then was in the *Priests, Magistrates, Professors* and *People* of all sorts; but especially in *Priests and Professors*. For tho' *Thou* to a single person was according to their Learning, their *Accidence and Grammar Rules*, and according to the *Bible*: yet they could not bear to hear it: And the *Hat-Honour*, because I could not put off my Hat to them, it set them all into a *Rage*. . . . Oh the *Rage and Scorn*, the *Heat and Fury* that arose! Oh! the *Blows, Punchings, Beatings and Imprisonments* that we underwent, for *not putting off our Hats* to Men! For that soon tried all Mens Patience and Sobriety, what it was. Some had *Hats* violently pluck'd off, and thrown away; so that they quite lost them. The *bad Language and evil Usage* we received on this Account, is hard to be expressed; besides the *Danger* we were sometimes in of losing our *Lives* for this Matter, and that by the great *Professors of Christianity*; who thereby discovered, that they were not true *Believers*. And though it was but a small thing in the Eye of Man; yet a wonderful *confusion* it brought among all *Professors and Priests*.¹

What a rich harvest of sin, from such a pitiful handful of seed; and how marvellous does it seem, that this wild youth should have had power and permission to bind such a yoke on thousands and tens of thousands in generations unborn? What sufferings did these trifles create, what anguish of mind and body, what stripes and imprisonments, what sacrifices of health and life? But if it was a command from God by an inspired prophet, who shall judge, who shall reply, who shall murmur?

The reflecting reader will perceive that the proposal to abandon 'the peculiarities'—even such of them as people now-a-days only laugh at—is a much more important one than at first

¹ Journal, p. 24.

sight it appears to be. As it regards Friends, it is not merely a question of 'hats-on,' or 'hats-off,' for decency's sake, or of bad grammar against good; but it is, 'Shall we deliberately and publicly withdraw our testimony to the divine mission of 'George Fox?' The Quaker who blinks this question is either ill-informed or unprincipled. Fox professed to be divinely inspired and commissioned; and if he is not received and acknowledged in the character of an inspired prophet, he must be set down for either a maniac or an impostor.

There is no other alternative. It is hardly necessary to cite proofs. His habitual language and mode of action preclude any doubt about his pretensions. 'The Lord said unto me'—'I was moved of the Lord to go'—'The Lord's power brake forth, and I had great openings and prophecies.' In what way is a man to assume the prophetic office among people who read the Bible, and form their ideas of a prophet from its pages, if it is not done by such language as this? or by the following:—'The Lord's everlasting power was over the world, and did reach to the hearts of people, and made both priests and professors tremble. It shook the earthly and airy spirit, in which they held their profession of religion and worship; so that it was a dreadful thing unto them, when it was told them, "The man in leathern breeches is come." At the hearing thereof the priests in many places would get out of the way; they were so struck with the dread of the eternal power of God: and fear surprised the hypocrites.'¹ What were people to understand by his telling them, 'I returned into Westmorland, and spake through Kendal upon a Market-day: And so dreadful was the power of God, that was upon me, that people flew, like chaff, before me into their houses. I warned them of the mighty day of the Lord, and exhorted them to hearken to the voice of God in their own hearts, who was *now* come to teach his people himself.'² With what scorn would the man who habitually used such language as this have turned from some modern attempts to explain away its obvious meaning.

Without the least wish to represent George Fox as better or worse than he really was, we must repeat, that a person who talked and acted as he did, could only be received as a prophet, a maniac, or a cheat. By the multitude he was no doubt viewed in one or other of the two latter characters; but many were prepared to admit his pretensions, and receive him as a teacher specially sent from God. This may seem strange—it would have been no wonder had it been simply that a fierce young man, in a grey coat and leathern breeches, with long curling

¹ Journal, p. 60.

² Ibid. p. 81.

hair, colossal form, and ultra-stentorian voice, rushing from one steeple-house to another to denounce priests and tithes, and tell the people not to go to church, or pay money, had been cheered on by a mob at his heels—it would have been no wonder if, beside this, he had been taken up and patronised by some who, while the ‘light within’ them was darkness, preferred his notion of being led by it, to being bound down by a written Revelation with a code of morals, and of religious discipline, founded on it. It was natural, too, that when such a leader got into scrapes, for which he obviously had peculiar opportunities and endowments, he should get a party about him. But all this, and more which will occur to the reader, may appear to him altogether insufficient to account for the facts. He may still reasonably ask why George Fox was originally received as he was, and why he is considered as he now is; and the times in which we live present some features which give to the inquiry an interest and importance which it may not at first appear to possess.

When the people who lived in the middle of the seventeenth century saw an uneducated youth abandoning all lawful calling, all home duties and ties of kindred, making extravagant pretensions, and doing extravagant things—when he called upon them to turn from the teachers whom they had been taught to look up to with reverence, and submit to the dreadful power of God who was *now* come to teach them himself—it was not only natural, but right, to ask, ‘What sign showest thou?’ This question no doubt was asked; and it was either answered, or anticipated, by facts very little understood in the present day, even by Quakers themselves. When the sect was well established, and times, as well as the state of men’s minds had altered, Friends thought it ‘best wisdom’ to say but little of some early passages in their history. We do not mean to charge modern Friends with denying or disputing George Fox’s claims to divine mission and supernatural power. Whoever looks at the index of the modern edition of his Journal, under the words ‘Miracles’ and ‘Visions,’ will find quite enough to clear those concerned in the work of republication from any charge of the kind. At the same time, though they may have fairly put in, and may fully believe, all the miracles and visions originally recorded in the Journal, and though we may thus be furnished with a sufficient record of ancient and modern Quaker doctrine on this point, yet we have reason to believe that there was much more which Fox himself did not record, or which the original editors of his Journal cancelled; but of which we may obtain some, though but scanty, information from other sources.

There is, indeed, in the Journal itself, one very curious and pregnant passage. Fox tells us, that—

'Coming to Mansfield-Woodhouse, there was a distracted Woman under a Doctor's Hand, with her Hair loose all about her Ears; and he was about to let her Blood, she being first bound, and many people being about her, holding her by Violence: But he could get no Blood from her. And I desired them to unbind her, and let her alone; for they could not touch the Spirit in her by which she was tormented: So they did unbind her. And I was moved to speak to her, and in the Name of the Lord to bid her Be quiet and still: And she was so. And the Lord's Power settled her Mind, and she mended; and afterwards received the Truth, and continued in it to her Death. And the Lord's name was honoured; To whom the Glory of all his Works belongs. Many great and wonderful things were wrought by the heavenly Power in those Days. For the Lord made bare his Omnipotent Arm, and manifested his Power to the Astonishment of many; by the healing Vertue whereof many have been delivered from great Infirmities, and the Devils were made subject through his Name: Of which particular Instances might be given, beyond what this unbelieving Age is able to receive or bear.'¹

The 'Doctor,' in this case, certainly was not Mesmer, or one of his disciples. If it had been, we should be curious to see his report of it, as well as of some other 'particular instances' which, though judged unfit for publication in 'Fox's Journal,' were not wholly unrecorded elsewhere, and are marked by some singular phenomena. This hint may lead the reader to notice some things in the following pages which, without it, might not strike him. If it leads him to farther research, he will find himself repaid.

There is no doubt that the age in which Quakerism was born was 'able to receive and bear' a great deal which, when the 'Journal' came to be published after nearly half a century, would have excited contempt and ridicule. If the world had become more unbelieving during a long period of dominant impiety, the Quakers had become a very different people from their founders, and were surrounded by opponents considerably unlike the fierce sectarians with whom their veterans had had to contend. In fact, to understand the matter at all, we must look rather more generally at the religious state of the times; and, obscure as those times are, we shall see enough to learn that they were very much influenced by persons who could preach and practise, as well as 'receive and bear,' very strange things. Indeed, we cannot but hope that even the few extracts which we have given may have afforded the reader some proof of this, and may facilitate his comprehension and belief of some further evidence.

It was truly a wonderful state of things. After speaking of the Puritans, Lord Macaulay says, 'It is also to be noted, that 'during the civil troubles several sects had sprung into existence, 'whose eccentricities surpassed anything that had before been

¹ Journal, p. 27.

'seen in England.' Certainly, this is a thing to be noted; and it is one which has never been inquired into as it deserves. If it had been, his lordship could not have given such an illustration as follows in his next sentence:—'A mad tailor, named Muggleton, wandered from pothouse to pothouse tippling ale, and denouncing eternal torments against those who refused to believe, on his testimony, that the Supreme Being was only six feet high, and that the sun was just four miles from the earth.'¹

We have nothing to say against his lordship's describing Muggleton as 'a mad tailor,' for such we believe the poor man was; but with regard to the assertions that he was given to tippling, that he taught any doctrine about the sun's distance, and that he denounced eternal torments on anybody for simply refusing to believe as he did on that, or any other point, we very much doubt. As to the rest, it derives some little colour, at least the historian's misstatement is in some degree accounted for, by Muggleton's occasionally adopting, in defiance, the phraseology of that burlesque representation of his doctrines in which some of his Quaker opponents indulged. He maintained that spirit never existed without matter; that God was revealed to man, and known by man, only as manifest in the flesh; and, for his own part, he acknowledged no God but Jesus Christ;—that, as man was made in the image of God, it was to be inferred that the Deity had a form like the form of man. These and other *dicta* were put together by the Quakers, who thought it argumentative, or witty, or at least, we will hope, not irreverent, to laugh at the tailor for worshipping a God who could not, they said, be supposed to be more than six feet high; and to ask how a Deity of such mean dimensions could span the heavens, and hold the waters in the hollow of his hand. We need not say that we are not defending Muggleton or his opinions; but without some such statement and explanation, the reader would not understand what follows.

Long before we saw Lord Macaulay's work, we had been most fully convinced of the fanaticism, heresy, and insanity of the poor tailor; but at the same time led to believe that he did more than any other individual to put down the rampant fanaticism which was raging in daemon forms of folly and blasphemy. This is strong language; but it is a very inadequate expression of an opinion formed many years since, after much inquiry and consideration:—'A cake of barley-bread tumbled into the host of Midian, and came unto a tent, and smote it that it fell.' It was, no doubt, an insane delusion to

¹ Vol. i. p. 163.

believe that the Almighty had given to him, or exercised through him, the power of giving solemn judgment on the eternal state of any of his fellow-men; but as to his actual exercise of that power, we have not been able to find that he ever passed sentence on any man for anything but what he, in his insanity, considered as the sin against the Holy Ghost, which in his view consisted, not in disbelieving, or refusing to receive, but in reviling and scoffing at what he called 'The Commission of the Spirit.' Something more of this will appear when we see him in collision with the Ranters, who were perhaps the most remarkable fanatics of that day, and whose proceedings must be noticed if we would understand the times.

But first let us borrow a few words from a better known and more respected source. Richard Baxter, in his autobiography, after describing two other sects, the *Seekers* and the *Vanists* says,—

'The third sect were the *Ranters*: these also made it their 'business, as the former, to set up the light of nature, under 'the name of Christ in men, and to dishonour and cry down 'the Church, the Scripture, the present ministry, and our 'worship and ordinances; and called men to hearken to Christ 'within them. But withal they conjoined a cursed doctrine of 'libertinism, which brought them to all abominable filthiness of 'life.'

After some illustration of this statement, he proceeds to say, that 'The horrid villanies of this sect did not only speedily 'extinguish it, but also did as much as anything did to disagree 'all sectaries, and to restore the credit of the ministry and the 'sober unanimous Christians: so that the devils and the Jesuits 'quickly found that this way served not their turn, and there- 'fore they suddenly took another. And that was the fourth 'sect, the Quakers; who were but the Ranters turned from 'horrid profaneness and blasphemy to a life of extreme austerity 'on the other side.'

Baxter, however, professed to have had no personal knowledge of the Ranters; and says in a marginal note, 'They were 'so very few and of short continuance that I never saw one of 'them.' He spoke truly, according to his knowledge; but the Ranters were, no doubt, more numerous and long-lived than he supposed. People do not always know all their neighbours. It might perhaps surprise some of the London clergy of the present day to learn that it is possible, indeed not very improbable, that they may have Muggletonian parishioners; and

¹ Lib. i. § 122, p. 76.

that they may buy Muggletonian books, printed or reprinted in London within these twenty years—perhaps much more recently, though we do not recollect having seen any. Muggleton knew much more about the Ranters than Baxter did, and he says in his quaint autobiography,—

‘After this it came to pass, in the year 1650. I heard of several Prophets and Prophetess that were about the streets, and declared the Day of the Lord, and many other wonderful Things as from the Lord. Also, at the same time, I heard of two other Men, that were counted greater than Prophets; to wit, John Tannye, and John Robins. John Tannye, he declared himself to be the Lord’s High Priest, and that he was to act over the Law of Moses again; therefore he circumcised himself according to Law. Also he declared that he was to gather the Jews out of all Nations, and lead them to Mount Olives, to Jerusalem; and that he was King of Seven Nations: With many other strange and wonderful Things. And as for John Robins, he declared himself to be God Almighty; and that he was the Judge of the Quick and of the Dead,’ &c.¹

He afterwards sums up the Ranters’ character by saying,— ‘Now John Robins was that man of sin spoken of in Thessalonians: neither will there come any so high after him, to the end of the world.’²

John Reeve, Muggleton’s cousin, was like him a tailor. ‘His father was clerk to a deputy in Ireland, a gentleman, as ‘we call them,’ says Muggleton, ‘but fell into decay.’ ‘He was ‘a man of no great natural wit or wisdom; no subtilty or policy ‘was in him, nor no great store of religion he had, but what ‘was traditional, only of an innocent life.’³ How John Reeve fell in with John Robins we have not learned; but he seems to have been altogether astonished, partly proselyted, and nearly, if not quite, crazed by him: ‘for John Robins’s knowledge ‘and language overpowered John Reeve.’ This is not very wonderful, seeing that John Robins’s doings were much out of the common way.

There is no reason for transcribing all the profane absurdities which are recorded by John Reeve; but some of them must be mentioned if we would understand what was going on at that time, and what the age would ‘receive or bear’:—

‘This John Robins did declare, that he was to gather the Jews in all nations, and to lead them into their own land, unto Jerusalem; with many more such like things declared by him. As for his lying spiritual signs and wonders, they were these and such like: unto some that were deceived by him, he did present the form of his person riding upon the wings of the wind, like unto a flame of fire: also he did present unto some in their beds a great light like unto a flame of fire over all the room, that they have been compelled to hide their faces in their beds, fearing they should be burned; but when they hid their faces in their bed, the light did appear

¹ Acts of Wit. p. 20.

² Ibid. p. 48.

³ Ibid. p. 5.

more brighter than before : also he would present unto them half-moons and stars, and sometimes thick darkness, darker than any natural darkness whatsoever : also he did present his head only in the day-time, without a body, to a gentlewoman that I know, in her chamber ; also presenting unto her, to deceive her, the forms of strange beasts as, namely, dragons and such like. Again, I declare from the Lord, that this John Robins did present the form of his face, looking me in the face in my bed the most part of a night, insomuch that I cried in my spirit unto the Lord, and the Lord, by his Spirit, revealed this great Antichrist unto me, to my exceeding joy and his everlasting praise. Much more might be spoken of his deceits in this kind ; but now I shall declare the manner of his being worshipped as a God by those deceived by him. They prayed unto him, and they fell flat on their faces and worshipped him, calling him their Lord and their God : also he gave commandment to some of them that they should not make mention of any other God, but him only : also he gave authority unto some of his disciples, both unto men and women, to change their wives and their husbands, telling them that they were not united to their own bone. This cursed Cain changed his own wife first, for an example, and called her name Eve, telling his disciples that she should bring forth his son Jesus, and it should be caught up into heaven : many of his disciples following of his cursed example, to their utter ruin in this life, and that to come. Also he commanded his disciples to abstain from meats and drinks, promising them that they should in a short time be fed with manna from heaven, until many a poor soul was almost starved under his diet, yea, and some were absolutely starved to death, whose bodies could not bear his diet : for those that believed on him indeed, they brought in their whole estates unto him, so that then he had full power over their souls, and bodies, and estates, and he did plague their spirits and bodies at his pleasure in a most dreadful manner, if they were not obedient to his commands, of the which I myself was an eye-witness. I could speak more of this prince of devils in this last age, but I know I have written enough for a spiritual Christian to discern something of this great deceiver in what I have written.'—*Reeve's Transc. Spirit. Treat.* p. 4.

Such is the account of John Robins, which is given by John Reeve. Whilst he was gaining this information, his cousin Muggleton was suffering in a state of religious melancholy, which he pathetically describes in his autobiography ; the early part of which (that is, what relates to the first forty years of his life) presents a singular and interesting picture of an earnest, simple-minded hypochondriac with a strong propensity to speculate on things beyond his depth, and utterly at a loss what to believe, or do, in the Babel by which he was surrounded—worn out with controversies, and tired of receiving and rejecting doctrines, and almost driven to atheism.

'Yet,' he says, 'I considered that innocency of heart, and a just upright spirit, was good in itself, if there were no God to reward it . . . therefore I was loath to let go my integrity, but kept close to it ; for as I had been innocent from my childhood to this day, I was resolved to keep to it to the end, if there were nothing after death, yet would I keep my heart upright, and would do nothing to wound my conscience. For I never had no guilt of actual sin that did ever trouble me . . . so I was resolved to keep myself as I always had done, unspotted of the world, and not to defile my conscience : And I

had a great deal of peace of mind in this condition : And in this condition did I continue some three years, untill I was about forty years old, and in the year 1650.¹

At this time, he tells us, he 'gave over all publick prayer, 'and hearing, and discourse about Religion;' and he seems to have had no disposition to become a disciple of John Robins; but, at the same time, to have been well aware of what was going on, without feeling that it was his business to interfere. He says:—

'These things had I perfect knowledge of, yet was I quiet and still, and heard what was said and done, and spake against nothing that was said or done. But shewed Kindness and Mercy to all of them, marvelling in myself what the Effect of these Things would be. And one of his Prophets came to my House very oft, and he told me all things that was done amongst them; and he had a very high Language, and very knowing in the Scriptures, and spake as an Angel of God. And my natural temper was always merciful to Strangers; and this place of Scripture run much in my Mind: Forget not to entertain Strangers, for some in entertaining of Strangers have entertained Angels. So I never let him go without Eating and Drinking. And if I had nothing in the House to Eat, if I had but Eighteen Pence I would give him One Shilling of it; and if I had but Twelve Pence, I would give him Sixpence of it. This I did many times, though I had need enough myself, for I had three Children to maintain at that time; two Daughters by my Wife Sarah, and one Son by my second Wife, Mary, then alive.'²

But so it was, this poor ex-Puritan tailor tells us, that while he was minding his business, and providing for his family in the year 1651, and in the year of his 'life 41 and better,'— 'Upon a day in the month called April, I being silent, all 'alone, my children being all abroad, there fell upon me a great 'melancholy upon my spirit, and I knew not for what, yet I was 'pressed exceedingly in my heart with fear.' He was tempted to return to the Puritans; but he recollected that he had found no peace among them, and felt that it would be 'to no purpose to turn or go back to Egypt again,'— 'then,' he says, 'did 'two motions arise in me, and speak in me as two lively voices; 'as if two spirits had been speaking in me, one answering the 'other, as if they were not my own spirit.'³ These motional voices held him in torment all day with disputes, which he records at considerable length, respecting election, reprobation, and eternal torments, till he was 'very melancholy, faint, and sickly,' with the day's dispute.

'Yet,' he says, 'it was a blessed day to me, as will appear hereafter, by that which followeth. After this, that very same night, the windows of heaven were opened to me, and the fountains of the water in heaven were broken up, and the water of life run down from heaven upon me . . . then was the Scriptures opened unto me so swiftly and more swiftly than my understanding could receive it; and the waters of life run down

¹ Acts of Wit. p. 18.

² Ibid. p. 22.

³ Ibid. p. 24.

from the understanding of the Scriptures abundantly: And the knowledge of the Scriptures flowed in upon my understanding faster than I could receive it, and yet I thought my mind was very swift. . . . these, and many more, places of Scripture was set before me, and the light of them shined clear about my understanding, and gave the interpretation of all Scripture, and all questions in spiritual things, that could arise out of the heart of man, was easy to me to answer.¹

One would naturally expect to see the ecstatic tailor (especially if he was a 'drunken tailor'), under these circumstances, and with this opinion of himself and his capabilities, leap from his board and seat himself in the chair of theology. But it was quite otherwise.

'I never,' he says, 'was without motional voices opening the Scriptures all day long, when I was alone, for a long time after. So that I was so well satisfied in my mind as to my eternal happiness, so that I was resolved now to be quiet and still, and not to meddle no more with religion, but to let every one go on in their own way, for I looked at nobody's peace and happiness but my own . . . for I lov'd for to be private and still; for my nature could never endure to be publick. So I thought all was well now I had attained my desire. But when I thought to be most secure and most private, in a little time after, it made me the most publick.'²

The facts seem to have been these—that during this excitement, John Reeve was much with his cousin, Muggleton, wondering at his revelations, and imbibing his enthusiasm; and at length, as a very natural consequence, he came to imagine that he had revelations himself. In particular, what he calls a 'Commission received by Voice of Words from the Spirit of 'the Man Jesus in Glory,' on the 3d, 4th and 5th days of February, 1651-2. Some of the words which he professed (and we really think believed) that he heard on the first of these days were:—

'I have chosen thee my last messenger for a great work, unto 'this bloody unbelieving world; and I have given thee Lodowick 'Muggleton to be thy mouth . . . I have put the two-edged sword 'of my Spirit into thy mouth, that whoever I pronounce blessed 'through thy mouth, is blessed to eternity; and whoever I pronounce cursed through thy mouth, is cursed to eternity.' 'When,' he says, 'I heard these words, my spirit desired the 'Lord, that I might not be his dreadful messenger: for indeed 'I thought upon the delivering of so sad an unexpected message 'unto men, I should immediately have been torn in pieces.' But the command was (he imagined) enforced by awful threatenings. 'The next morning,' he says, 'the Lord spake unto 'me, saying, "Go thou unto Lodowick Muggleton, and with 'him go unto Thomas Turner, and he shall bring you to one 'John Tane, and do thou deliver my message when thou comest

¹ Acts of Wit. pp. 32, 33.

² Ibid. p. 35.

'there; and if Lodowick Muggleton deny to go with thee, then 'do thou from me pronounce him cursed to eternity.'" On the 'third morning the command was, "Go thou to Lodowick Muggleton, and take such a woman along with thee; and 'then go thou unto John Robins, a prisoner in New Bridewell, 'and do thou deliver my message to him when thou comest 'there.'" ¹

We certainly do not believe, or wish any body else to believe, that John Reeve really heard any such 'voice of words,' or received any such commission as he describes; but there is something in the earnest, and even eloquent, simplicity with which he speaks on the subject, which may plead for a charitable belief that he was sincere. Writing some years afterwards in reply to Isaac Pennington, he says:—

'When the Lord made choise of such a simple poor man as I was, as many can witness in the City of London, that have known me about these twenty years, that I might instrumentally discover the two principal heads of mischievous darkness in the land; as namely John Robins past, and John Tawney almost spent, truly I had no power in me to put by his message until another time; why because (whether you can believe it or no) his voice was so glorious in me, that it shone as the sun, and it was of motion swifter than thought, and so [*read, too*] pleasant to be declared by tongue; yet for all that Godlike glory piercing in me, and through me, there arose a desire in me to be eased of that burden of the Lord committed to my charge, because of that sharp sentence that I was to declare against any man that should despise it; then the Lord spake again unto my soul, words of burning death, of sensible unutterable darkness, answerable to that Jonas-like rebellion in me, against so great convincing glory; and truly I was compelled immediately to cry unto him for deliverance from the wounds or anguish of my soul, that I might presently obey his word that shined in me with such light, and majesty, and glory in whatsoever it should command me.—*Stream from the Tree of Life*, p. 78.

It may be supposed that John Reeve reported these matters, as they occurred, to his cousin; and the most remarkable part of the story is the manner in which Muggleton received the communications. He tells us:—

'The first morning God spake to John Reeve, he came to my House, and said, Cousin Lodowick, God hath given thee unto me for ever: And the tears ran down both sides his Cheeks amain. So I asked him what was the Matter, for he looked like one that had been risen out of the Grave; he being a fresh coloured Man the Day before; and the tears ran down his Cheeks aspace. So he told me the same Words as is written in his first Book, and said unto me, that God had given him a commission, and that he had given Lodowick Muggleton to be his Mouth: and said, at the same time was brought to his Mind that saying, that Aaron was given to be Moses's mouth. But, said he, What my message is, he could not tell; but, said he, if God do not speak unto me the next Morning, I will come no more at thee. Which I was in good hopes he would not, for I was willing to be quiet.' ²

¹ Tr. Sp. Tr. pp. 1, 2.

² Acts of Wit. p. 41.

This hope, however, was vain ; for the next morning John Reeve came to summon his cousin to go with him and attack John Tauny ; and together they went, 'and John Reeve delivered his message to him to this effect : said he, " God hath ' chosen you to be the Lord's High Priest," ' ¹ recapitulating and formally contradicting the various pretensions which we have specified ; and Muggleton adds:—

' These, and several other things did he speak to John Tauny ; and told him that there should never any such things come to pass, as he pretended unto ; and charged him to lay all these things down, upon the pain of eternal damnation, and gave him about a Month's time to lay it down. But he did not, but afterwards went further on to prosecute that Design, and made Tents for every Tribe, and the Figures of every Tribe upon the Tent, that every Tribe might know their own Tent. So John Reeve seeing this, he wrote the sentence of eternal damnation upon John Tauny, for his disobedience of the Lord's Commission, and left it at his Lodging ; for he would not be spoken with at that time. Because he had shut himself up for nine Days, and he would speak with none for that time : But he received it afterwards of the Man where he Lodged ; and after awhile he and his great Matters perished in the Sea. For he made a little Boat to carry him to Jerusalem, and going to Holland, to call the Jews there, he and one Captain James were cast away and Drowned ; so all his Power came to nothing.' ²

But it remained to attack the leader of the sect ; and Muggleton gives the following account of their interview with John Robins. Having told us how he and John Reeve found Dorcas Boose (the ' such a woman ' mentioned in the commission) he proceeds :—

' So we three went to New Bridewell, and asked for John Robins ; and the Keeper opened the Gate, and said, " Who would you speak with ? " John Reeve said, " With John Robins." The Keeper said, " You shall not speak with him." Then said John Reeve to the Keeper, " Thou shalt never be at Peace." So he shut the little gate upon us ; and as we stood a little while without the Gate, there came a Woman, a Disciple of John Robins, to come out : Saith the Keeper to the Woman, " There is two or three without would speak with your Lord, shew them the other way." So the Keeper let the Woman out, and the Woman said unto John Reeve, " Would you speak with my Lord ? " " Yea," saith he, " I would speak with thy Lord : " saith the Woman, " He is the same, and will be the same for ever." " Thou saith right," said he, " He is the same, and will be the same for ever." Meaning the same false Christ for ever. So the Woman went and showed us the Place where John Robins was ; and she said, " Knock at that window, and my Lord will look out." So the Woman parted from us ; then John Robins put by a Board of the Window, and looked out, and John Reeve put off his Hat, and held it under his Arm, and said, " Art thou John Robins ? " He said to John Reeve, " Put on your Hat." He said, " I put it not off to thee, but to him that sent me." " Stand thou still and hear the message of the Lord to thee." He answer'd and said, " I will not, except you put on your Hat : " This he said three times. Said John Reeve the

¹ Acts of Wit. p. 43.

² Ibid. p. 44.

third time, "I put not my Hat off to thee, but to him that sent me; therefore I charge thee to stand still, and hear the Message of the Lord to thee." After the third time John Robins said, "Speak on." Then John Reeve spake, and said, "Thou may'st remember I was with thee about Six or Eight Months ago, and thou didst declare unto me, That thou wert Adam Melchisedeck that met Abraham in the Way, that received the tythes of the Spoil, and that gave Abraham bread and wine, [and after recapitulating various charges against him, which have been already specified, he added], therefore look what measure thou hast measured to others, must be measur'd again to thee. That Body of thine, which was thy Heaven, must be thy Hell; and that proud Spirit of thine, which [g. thou] said was God, must be thy Devil. The one shall be as Fire, and the other as Brimstone, burning together to all Eternity. This is the Message of the Lord unto thee." John Robins pulled his Hands off the Grates, and laid them together, and said, "It is finished; the Lord's will be done." These were all the words spake: I was both an Eye-Witness and Ear-Witness of it. After this it came to pass, that about two Months after, John Robins did write a Letter of recantation of all his great Matters, unto General Cromwell, and so obtained his liberty out of prison."¹

But though we have thought it necessary to say so much of the Ranters and the self-styled Witnesses, and trust that its relevancy will be made manifest to those who read the sequel, yet it is time to show how the Witnesses and the Quakers came into collision.

As early as the year 1653 Reeve and Muggleton had been brought before the Lord Mayor; and the 'Transcendant Spiritual Treatise' of the latter formed the first head of the accusation against them—"the Lord Mayor had this book in his hand"²—how much of it he understood we pretend not to guess; but when John Reeve repeated to him the commission which he had (he said) received 'by the voice of words'—"the Lord Mayor answered John Reeve, and said, "He did believe 'it was the Devil that spake to him.'" Then to this (says 'Muggleton') I answered and said, Sir, you have sinned against 'the Holy Ghost, and will be damned. The Mayor clapt 'his hand upon his breast, and said "God forbid." Yea, said 'I, but you have.' The Lord Mayor, however, thought fit to commit the prisoners for trial under the new act against blasphemy, and forthwith sent them to Newgate. Being in due course tried and convicted, they were sentenced to be imprisoned for six months in Old Bridewell; and it was while they were undergoing this punishment (that is, between October, 1653, and April, 1654) that they fell in with the Quakers.

How this happened we do not know; for though it seems certain, from the evidence, that George Fox, Edward Burrough, and Francis Howgill were all in London during part of that time, it does not appear that they had anything to do with Old

¹ Acts of Wit. p. 45.

² Ibid. p. 68.

Bridewell. It is, however, very probable that some of their friends might have been sent there (as Isabel Buttery certainly was soon after) and that they might go to visit them. At all events, it seems that the parties did meet at that time and place; and that Reeve and Muggleton determined to deal with the Quakers as they had dealt with the Ranters, and the Ranters with them and with others, or, we might perhaps say, as the more fanatical sects were in the habit of dealing with each other.

In order to understand the matter we must look fairly at one very strange and repulsive feature of the sectarianism at that time prevalent. It may seem strange to a reader of these days, that John Reeve, whatever degree of fanaticism or craziness we assign to him, and even though (if we may trust William Penn's relation of private discourse) Muggleton acknowledged that 'he thought him hot-brained and distempered in his head,'¹ should have thought of being empowered to bless or curse his fellow men to eternity. But the idea was familiar to the time and among the people with whom he was conversant; and it was expressed coarsely and without mincing. In modern phraseology 'cursing and swearing' generally go together; but it will be obvious that in the case of the Quakers, as in that of some others of the period, they were quite distinct things; and men who could by no means be brought to swear, would curse fearfully. It will be apparent to those who read the sectarian writings of the period, that the antagonist sects had an idea of overcoming each other by the 'Power' in which, and with which, they spoke; and though they certainly had no right to curse one another as they did, and might be none the worse as to either their temporal or their eternal state for each other's curses, yet it is clear that the leaders had—and became leaders from having—some 'Power' by which they produced strange effects on their hearers. The exhibitions and effects of this power, though they have disappeared from the lifeless Quakerism of modern times, and infrequently and obscurely as their more early history is recorded, present some phenomena worth the attention of physiological and psychological students. This will be apparent to those who have in any degree studied the details of superstition and fanaticism relating to any period from the days of the Witch of Endor to those of Mr. John Lacy; and especially to those who have seen enough of Mesmerism and Irvingism to be satisfied of their points of identity, not only with things which have been, and with each other, but also with things that are, and seem likely to be hereafter.

It 'was Justice Bennet of Darby,' says George Fox, 'who

¹ Penn's Works, vol. ii. p. 178.

'was the first that called us Quakers, because I bid them "Tremble at the Word of the Lord," and this was in the year 1650.' This was passing over the matter very easily, and in a way which the age of *publication* could 'receive and bear.' And beside this, it was very well and sufficient to tell people that Jeremiah the prophet trembled, and his bones quaked, &c.; but Robert Barclay was more honest. He says, 'We are sensible of this Power that hath often laid hold of our Adversaries, and made them yield unto us, and joyn with us, and confess to the Truth, before they had any distinct or discursive Knowledge of our *Doctrines*; so that sometimes many at one Meeting have been thus convinced: And this Power would sometimes also reach to, and wonderfully work even in little Children, to the Admiration and Astonishment of many.'

No doubt many admired and were astonished; not only at the performances of the children—though their goings on have been among the most curious phenomena in various manifestations of fanaticism—but at the visible and sensible effects produced on those who could not in any sense be called believers or disciples.

A curious little notice of the subject may be found at the beginning of Besse's second volume of 'Sufferings.' He tells us that in the year 1652, as James Naylor (afterwards too well known in Quaker history for his 'outgoings after imaginations') was coming towards Kendal,—

'Two priests with a justice of the peace and some other magistrates, with a great multitude following them, met him, and one of the priests said to him, "Naylor, I have a message from the Lord Jesus Christ to thee, but this is not a convenient place." To which James answered, "The Lord Jesus Christ is no respecter of places." The priest then delivered what he called his message thus, "I conjure thee to tell me by what Power thou inflictest such punishment upon the bodies of creatures?" James answered, "Dost thou remember who it was that did adjure Christ to tell him if he were the Son of God, and asked by what authority he did those things?" But the priest still conjured him to tell, "By what Power he did it?" James [who seems to have been in a metaphorical sense, as he was in the literal, an old soldier] said, "Dost thou acknowledge it to be done by a Power?" "Yea," said the priest, "I have the Spirit of God, and thereby I know it is done by a Power." James said, "If thou hast the Spirit of God, as thou sayst thou hast, then thou canst tell by what Power it is done." The priest said, "When God cometh, he comes to torment the souls, and not the bodies."

The priest gained little by his inquiry, but the anecdote is rendered more valuable by the note which the historian appends. He says, 'The divine Power which attended the ministry of Naylor, and others of those early witnesses to the truth, wrought so effectually on the spirits of some of their hearers, that their bodies were affected therewith to the surprise of the

'priests, and such as were not acquainted with the nature of those operations; and which therefore this priest ignorantly called inflicting punishment.' That James Naylor had some Power which made his opponents afraid of him seems very clear. George Whitehead, in his Epistle prefixed to Naylor's works, says, that 'after the said James Naylor was brought under suffering and contempt . . . persons of a loose ranting spirit got up, and frequently disturbed our Friends Meetings in London by their ranting, singing, bawling and reproaching us, crying out against divers of our faithful ministers and their testimonies in this manner, *viz.* "You have lost the Power; you have lost the Power,"' &c.¹

The question, indeed, between those who engaged in controversy, as it was then conducted, was, whose Power should predominate, whose curse should 'be over' the other. The point in dispute between John Reeve and the Ranters was, whose curse was most potent? After the sentence pronounced on John Robins, his followers, says Muggleton, 'consulted among themselves why they might not damn us, as we did them.' And he proceeds to relate how one Proudlove consulted with 'three of the most desperatest, atheistical Ranters that had ever been' in their company. 'They asked him what they must do. He said, "You must curse them [Reeve and Muggleton] and their God, and perhaps you may bring down their Power."' It was a matter of challenge, and a trial of strength. 'Now we sent,' says George Fox, 'to the Ranters to come forth and try their God: and there came abundance of them, who were very rude and sung, and whistled and danced: but the Lord's Power so confounded them that many of them came to be convinced.'

Such being the state of things at this period, it is not to be wondered at that the newly-arrived Quakers should have fallen in with the Witnesses, and that a quarrel should have ensued;

¹ Those who are acquainted with the history of Irvingism will not read the foregoing extracts without being reminded of it. Mr. Baxter, in his 'Narrative of Facts characterizing the supernatural Manifestations in Members of Mr. Irving's Congregation,' &c. says, 'I was commanded to go back to the church, where my mouth was opened, and, on the fortieth day, Power should be given, the sick should be healed, the deaf should hear, the dead should be restored, and all the mighty signs and wonders should appear; apostles and ministers should be ordained, endowed, and sent forth to the ends of the earth, to warn the world of the rapture of the saints, and make ready a people prepared for the Lord.'—2d Edit. p. 66. In his introduction, p. xxxi., he says that Mr. Irving had found one reason of his 'fall' in his having returned home, adding, 'if thou hadst heeded the counsel of him that sent thee (alluding here to the prophecy, p. 66, by which the writer was commanded to go to London, and receive the Power), and staid there where thy mouth was opened, until the Power was given, it would have been well with thee at this day instead of being very evil.'

² Acts of Wit. p. 56.

but that this actually happened we only know from an incidental statement made many years afterwards. The quarrel does not seem to have been carried on in any public manner. The Witnesses did not, as far as we know, use the pulpit at all; and it will be easily imagined that with their small means, and the impediments of the licensing system, the press was not of much use to them. Muggleton had lost his 'hot-brained' cousin; and, though he jealously resented any attempt to share his office and authority, it may be doubted whether he was ardent in the work of proselyting. When Lawrence Claxton presumed to usurp the place of John Reeve, the surviving prophet put him down with a high hand. Muggleton had always acknowledged the primacy of his cousin; though a solitary survivorship of forty years, during which he was more prominently brought before the public by Judge Jeffries, and the pillory, has made him the best known of the two. He fairly told the aspiring Claxton, 'Notwithstanding you have made yourself equal with John Reeve, you shall know that John Reeve was as Elijah, and that I am in the place of Elisha, and that you are in the place of Gehazi. This is my resolution.'¹ But as to proselyting, in answer to a joint letter from two eminent Quakers, Samuel Hooton and William Smith (beginning 'Friend, for so we can call thee, as Christ did Judas, and describing him as 'the man that wanders up and down to make sects,') he says, 'As for my wandering up and down to make sects, it is those of the Quakers that wander up and down. As those that went to New England, and John Parrot unto Rome, to get the Pope and his bishops to be disciples of Christ' . . . never was there any prophet, or apostle, or messenger of Christ, but they have travelled up and down more than ever I did, almost these eleven years, so that I have not travelled up and down as the Quakers have for to get either wise or fools to believe me.'² And in the same work, replying to Richard Farnsworth's charge of reviling, he says, 'Neither do I curse any, until he judge me first, much less revile any.' . . . I never bless none but those that truly believe it [his Power], neither do I curse any but those that despise or persecute me, upon that Account; but all that doth neither receive it nor despise it, I let them alone, and meddle not with them, but leave them to stand or fall as the two seeds within them shall uphold them or let them fall. And as for your saying that I have reviled, cursed, and damned the beloved people of God, meaning you Quakers: To that I say, I never did curse any of them till such time as they did judge or despise my commission first,

¹ *Spiritual Epistles*, p. 31.

² *Ibid.* p. 18.

³ *Neck of the Quakers Broken*, p. 17.

⁴ *Ibid.* n. 66.

'for I never do judge first.'¹ . . . By the authority of the commission I received from Christ, I am made chief judge in spiritual matters, in all those that doth either receive my doctrine or despise it: But as for others that doth neither receive it nor despise it, nor hear of it, I judge them not, but leave them as 'God shall find them at the last day.'²

These statements are confirmed by some others which he makes respecting the neglect and indifference with which his 'commission' and revelations had been treated, in times when almost any new and extravagant doctrine would have been sure to draw followers, if urged with zeal and perseverance. In the first ten years he tells us, his commission was not owned by much above forty persons;³ and when he was between seventy and eighty years of age, he declared that during thirty-three years that he had been a prophet, not one of his neighbours, acquaintance, or kindred, save only his own children, had believed his report.⁴ Fierce as he was when provoked to pronounce those 'sad sentences,' as he called them, we may yet believe him when he says, 'I durst not preach without a commission from God without me, and not by the light of Christ within me, though I had the light of Christ within me more than any Quaker in the world hath at this day, before I had a commission from God without me; and if God without me had not forced me to take this commission upon me, I had remained quiet and still, and had let Quakers and all other opinions in religion alone; for I was of Jonas his mind, willing to sit still and be quiet, for I minded nobody's happiness but my own.'⁵ And afterwards, in his reply to Isaac Pennington, 'If you had not written to me, against me and my revelation, I should have let you alone: for I never did judge any man or woman, till they did judge me first in one kind or other; either they judged me to be a blasphemer, a liar, deceiver, false prophet, deceit, deluder, or delusion; with other words of judging, before ever I give my judgment upon them.'⁶ And melancholy as it is to read such language, one cannot but believe that he was in earnest when he wrote to George Fox, 'If God will not own what I have said unto you despising Quakers, or if I judge thus without a commission and authority from the true God, let God judge me with the same judgment I have judged you and others with: this is as much as can be said by man.'⁷ Language as strong is used in his reply to Pennington.

¹ Neck of the Quakers Broken, p. 67.

² Looking Glass for George Fox, p. 46.

³ Looking Glass for George Fox, p. 14.
Ibid. p. 58.

⁴ Ibid. p. 77.

⁵ Sp. Epist. p. 575.

⁶ Ibid. p. 35.

⁷ Ibid. p. 31.

But, as we have said, ten years or so passed after the meeting in Old Bridewell without public controversy; and we need not say that many and great changes took place in all matters civil and ecclesiastical between 1653 and 1663. At length, provoked by such letters as those of which a little specimen has been given, Muggleton in the latter year published his 'Neck of the Quakers Broken.' It was a reply to 'Letters of Edward Bourne, Samuel Hooton, William Smith,' &c., and it drew an answer from the great leader of the sect. Muggleton rejoined in the year 1668 by a work intituled, 'A Looking Glass for George Fox the Quaker, and other Quakers wherein they may see themselves to be right Devils,' and he began without ceremony:—

'George Fox, I saw a pamphlet of yours, entitled, "Something in answer to Lodowick Muggleton's Book, which he calls, The Quaker's Neck Broken."

'You said well, in that you said, "Something in answer to that book of the Quaker's Neck Broken," for it is a very little Something indeed; it is so little a Something, that wise men will hardly discern any Thing in it as a direct Answer: But how comes it to pass that you make no mention of your own damnation in your Answer; you know John Reeve and myself gave you the sentence of damnation a matter of fourteen years ago, when we were prisoners in Old Bridewell; there was you, Edward Burroughs, and Francis Howgel, you three were counted the chief speakers of the Quakers at that time, and you three were the first speakers of the Quakers that were dam'd by us, the Witnesses of the Spirit; but since that there have fallen a many more of your brethren under this sentence.'

Having given a list of fourteen, he adds, 'These were generally all, or most of them, speakers of the Quakers, and exercised the ministerial preaching without a commission from God,' p. 7. Our business, however, is with the sixteenth chapter, which is headed, 'How the Sentence and Curse have subdued those Witchcraft fits in the Quakers.' It begins:—

'I do know and affirm, that those speakers of the Quakers, and others whom I have passed the Sentence of eternal Damnation upon, that they have not, nor do grow in any Experience nor Revelation, since the Sentence of Damnation was passed on them, as Experience doth plainly manifest, and many will Witness unto it. And as for Fox himself, what Experience and new Revelation of Scripture have you had since you were damned a Matter of fourteen Years ago? Have you published any other Things but what you did at the first? No, not so much as you did at the first; for then it was your principle of Zeal to fall into Witchcraft-fits, supposing it was the Spirit of Christ that moved you to foam at the Mouth, and sigh and groan, and swell with Spiritual Witchcraft, and howl and groan as if Hell were like to burst in you; and perhaps a while after your Spirit would break forth into a many non-sensical Words, as if the Devil had broke forth out of Hell. Was not this your Practice? And were not these the most eminent Quakers counted amongst you, who had those Witchcraft-fits? For

the Quakers Revelation doth arise in them only when the Witchcraft-fit is upon them; nay, I have known some that have followed the Quakers, desiring to be of them, and earnestly desiring in their Meetings to have those Fits as other Quakers had; for they thought such Persons who had those Witchcraft-fits, to be much in the Favour of God, and that those Fits had been wrought by the Spirit of Christ, and that he had revealed great things unto them; and because the Parties aforesaid could not produce those Fits in themselves, as they saw others have, notwithstanding their melancholy life, their framing their outward Apparel, and observing every Motion in the Mind, according to the Quakers Doctrine, they left no Stone unturned, nor no Endeavour neglected, in the Quakers Way, that they might attain those Witchcraft-fits, but could not attain them, do what they could: They got the Quakers Language of Thee and Thou, but could not attain the Fits; neither would some of those Quakers own one of these persons, because she had not such Fits as they had, so she was forced to leave them. And the Cause why these Persons aforesaid could have no such Fits, it was because they had talked with me before they fell to the Quakers Principles, so that no Witchcraft-fit could be produced in them, though their Endeavours were great.

‘Also I have drove the Witchcraft Power out of Quakers that have been strongly possest, so that they have never had Fit more. And as for you, Fox, have you ever had any Witchcraft-fit since you are damned? Did you ever fall into a Swoon, and lye as one dumb? And hath the Spirit of Reason, the Devil, which you call the Light of Christ in you, I ask, hath he revealed any Mysteries of the Scriptures in the Time of your Fit, since you are damned, fourteen Years ago? Is your Revelation of Reason to be seen in Writing, yea or nay.

‘Again hath Samuel Hooton, William Smith, Edward Bourn, Richard Farnsworth, and many others that were damned of late Years, have they had any Witchcraft-fits since? Or any new Revelation? If they have, let them be brought forth to the Light. Do you George Fox know any Quaker that I have passed the Sentence upon, that can produce a Witchcraft-fit afterwards? If no Fit can be produced as formerly, then I say no true Revelation nor Experience can arise in the Quakers Hearts: Nay, this Sentence, it puts a Stop to the Revelation of Reason also, else why should Quakers fall so, as you do, from your first Principle? For you are not like the People you were sixteen Years ago, there were few Quakers then but they had Witchcraft-fits, but now of late, I do not hear of any Quaker that hath any Fits, no, not so much as to buz or hum before the Fit comes. But if you Fox doth know any of you Quakers that have any of those Witchcraft-fits as formerly, bring them to me, or let me hear of it, and I shall cast out that Devil which causeth those Fits, so that they shall never have more, but shall be sensible and in their right Mind. So Fox, you shall find my Words to be Truth, and no Lie, that the Quakers, after the Sentence is passed upon them, shall never grow to have more Experience in Visions and Revelations, but shall wither. Do not you, Fox, find this to be true? If you do not, others will witness unto it to be true.

‘But you say, “The Truth Spreads.” I know the Truth spreads, but not the Quakers Witchcraft-fits, which produced Visions, Apparitions, and Revelations, which the Quakers thought had been produced by the Spirit of Christ, but they were produced by the Spirit of Reason the Devil, in themselves; and these Fits, Visions, Apparitions, and Revelations in the Quakers, are greatly withered away of late, by that Sentence I have passed upon the Speakers of the Quakers, and others of that Opinion, so that those Fits of theirs makes most People ashamed to own them, which formerly People thought them the most knowingest that was possest with a Witchcraft-fit; so that it is plain and clear, and many that were lovers of the Quakers

Way of Worship that can, and will witness, that their experience in Visions and Revelation are withered, and come to nothing.

'But Fox thinks because a many ignorant People comes to hear the Quakers speak their Ninny-nonies over and over again, therefore the Truth, as he calls it, spreads, but when it was at the best, it was but a Lie that spreads; indeed a Lye will spread very fast, but Truth spreads very slowly; for Truth was ten years in the World, and there was not much above forty Persons that owned it; but the Quakers at that Time had many Thousands that were Quakers.'—*Looking Glass for G. Fox*, p. 44.

This, as well as the history which has been previously given, is illustrated by the thirty-sixth chapter, from which we can take but a small portion—not only because part would be mere repetition, but because the coarseness of its language, and the nature of some of its details, are beyond what the present 'age can receive or bear.'

'If you Quakers were not wilfully ignorant and blind, you might see that this Commission of the Spirit, given to John Reeve and Muggleton, hath had great Power over the Ranters and Quakers. It hath broken the Ranters' principle all to Pieces, so that none dares hold up an Argument to defend it. You Quakers are also very much shattered, you are not like the People ye were sixteen Years ago; this, some that had a love for you, have seen and confessed.

'The Ranters, when we came out first, sixteen Years ago, were very high in their Elevations, in seeing of Visions, and going forth as Prophets and Prophetesses, and stripping themselves naked for Signs, as you Quakers have done. I can make it appear in some Particulars, that this Commission hath had great Power over Ranters and Quakers; for the Heads of these two were John Robins and John Taney. Robins was the Head of all false Christs, false Prophets, Prophetesses, Shakers, and Quakers; and you Quakers are but the Spawn of John Robins, and that Christ you own within you being a false Christ: John Robins was the Head of that Principle; also his Believers had those Witchcraft-fits upon them as you Quakers had, very strongly at that Time, when John Robins was in Power. Also John Taney was the Head of the Atheistical Ranters; and those Ranters were very high in their Language, and vile in their Practice. . . .

'Now do you, Fox, the Quaker, call to mind, and see whether his curse of Reeve and Muggleton hath not been over the Quakers' People, nor touched them? There hath a many Quaker been curst by us, but especially of late Years, by me. Have you yourself, Edward Borrowes, Francis Howgal, you three were the first Quakers John Reeve damned; have you three had any Witchcraft-fits since? Have you foamed at the mouth, and swollen in your belly, with the workings of the Spirit, and, as you think, as if you had the Falling-sickness? Have you had any new Vision, or new Revelation in those Witchcraft-fits since? Yea, or nay?

'I am sure it hath great Power over you Quakers, and hath put a stop to those Witchcraft-fits; for I do not hear of any Quaker of late that hath any; though they were never curst by me; this Curse hath run in the line of the Heads of the Quakers, so that it doth put a Stop to the whole Body, so that none of the Members can produce a Witchcraft-fit; nay, the Quakers are bereft of all Revelation now, and Messages to the Magistrates; they have left off stripping themselves, naked, and imitating the prophets of old.'—*Ibid.* p. 98.

It is clear that this—or rather the work which contained this, and a great deal more—came upon the sect like a thunder-bolt. ‘This book,’ says Muggleton, ‘caused the Quakers to ‘be exceedingly angry at me, and several speakers of them to ‘write cursed letters unto me, and some of them came to ‘discourse with me.’¹ Their method of dealing with him, and attempting to put down his Power, was characteristic.

The first shot in return seems to have been fired by Elizabeth Hooton, who had every right to lead the van as one of George Fox’s first disciples, and apparently the earliest female preacher of the sect; and moreover the mother of friend Samuel, whose letter to ‘friend Judas’ we have just had occasion to notice. We know it, however, only from the answer, and it is charitable to her, though not, perhaps, just towards the subject of her wrath, to hope that she did not use quite such language as is ascribed to her.²

The next correspondent whom he names, was Thomas Loe, then a leading man in the sect, though less known to posterity than his convert, William Penn. ‘Thomas Loe, of Oxford, was one’ of the friends whom Elwood met in early days at Isaac Penington’s; ‘a faithful and diligent labourer he was in the ‘work of the Lord, and an excellent ministerial gift he had.’³ And afterwards, when he was taken up, he says, ‘it pleased the ‘Lord to move the heart of my dear friend Thomas Loe, to ‘salute me with a very tender and affectionate letter.’⁴ Certainly the letter with which Loe saluted Muggleton was of a very different description, and has a claim to notice as the production of William Penn’s teacher. Indeed it is so characteristic and illustrative of the times and the parties, that it would be injustice not to give it entire. It will be observed, that there is no denial of facts, no defence of doctrine or practice, no pretence of argument or reference to authority; it is mere bullying, a counter-cuff intended to out-face and put down the antagonist Power.

‘Lodowick Muggleton, having seen some of thy writings, more especially thy book entitled, “A Looking Glass,” which I have looked in, and do clearly see thy wicked, abominable, and anti-Christian spirit; and can do no less than cry, Oh! thou blasphemous, thou enemy of God, and of all righteousness; thou son of perdition, and child of the devil; how hast thou laboured to pervert the right way of God, in speaking of the blessed truth! And, Oh! thou seed of the serpent, and old sorcerer, how hast thou belied, slandered, wickedly and falsely accused and condemned, the just! And now, be it known unto thee, that thy false judgment, and wicked envy, both in speaking and writing against the servants of the living God, is returned back upon thy own head; and thee, with it, will God, in his fury and indignation, sink in the pit of darkness, from whence it hath risen. And in the

¹ Acts of Wit. p. 114.

² Elw Mem. p. 58.

³ Sp. Epist. p. 228.

⁴ Ibid. p. 67.

great and mighty Power of God and Christ, I Reprove, Judge, and Condemn thee, which shall stand upon thy Head; and thy Power, thou boasteth so of, shall not reverse it. Oh! ignorant sot, how canst thou consider thy blasphemies, and not be ashamed. This is a Testimony in the Power and Spirit of God, against thee, and all thy wickedness, by a servant of Jesus Christ, who am a Witness of the Spirit and Power of God, with many others.”¹

‘Whoever may read this letter,’ says Muggleton, ‘let them understand thus much, that I never saw the man, nor he me; but he reading the book aforesaid was moved by the light within him to send this cursed letter to me.’ We have not Muggleton’s answer, but he tells us that (as might, of course, be expected) it contained ‘the Sentence.’ Thomas Loe survived but a short time; and that fact Muggleton considered as a testimony to his own Power. The same idea, or the apprehension that it might occur to others, seems to have wrought on his opponents: for, very shortly after, the tailor was visited by two Quakers of no less importance than George Whitehead and Josiah Cole. In the conversation which ensued, Cole asked Muggleton to state what he considered it necessary for him to do in order to his salvation. Muggleton answered, ‘to renounce Quakerism and believe in him.’ ‘Then,’ he says,—

‘Cole fell into a fit, and waited upon his own thoughts what to answer, and I waited for his answer. But George Whitehead perceived that Cole was in a strait, he came unto me, and spied a knot of ribbon upon my coat-sleeve, and said unto me, “Why dost thou wear this vanity?” and touched the ribbon with his fingers. I answered and said, “I know a piece of ribbon is a great sin in a Quaker’s eye: but,” said I, “why dost thou wear silk buttons on both thy coats?” He said, they were necessary: I said, “No, thou mightest wear hooks and eyes, claspes or eyletholes;” that was past by. “But then I will tell thee why I do wear ribbon, it is on purpose that I might not be taken, or thought to be a Quaker, for I do hate the Quakers’ principle.” With that Whitehead said, “Thou hatest all righteousness,” and spake as if he himself, Cole and Fox, and others of the Quakers were writing a book against me, to make me manifest, which in a little time after it was set forth by William Pen, a Quaker; and further said, that they would post me up, and he slighted my Power and my God and said, he would trample my God and my Power under his feet as dirt, and taped his foot upon the ground. Whereupon I did pronounce.—”²

What he pronounced will be easily imagined, and there is no good in needless repetition of such things; though if we are to have truth at all, they must be fairly outspoken, and plainly dealt with. The sentence roused Whitehead’s companion:—

‘With that Josiah Cole rose up with great zeal for his God within him, and said, “I told thee before that I would try thee and thy God,” saying, that they were setting forth a writing against me, and, withal Cole pronounced many curses upon me, with his eyes dazzled with the witchcraft

¹ Acts of Wit. p. 114.

² Ibid. p. 118.

power in him, being disturbed with my words, it got up into his head. So that Whitehead and he both came near me with great threat'nings and judgments upon me, being both so full of curses : Cole cursed me into utter darkness, pit of darkness, chains of darkness, blackness of darkness, and that he would trample that God of mine, that was in the form of Man, under his feet, as dirt, and stamp'd his foot upon the ground, as the other devil did : Cole's curses were much, what like Thomas Loe, his curses in his letter to me.¹

In a letter written while the facts were recent, Muggleton says:—' Cole pronounced many curses upon me, with his eyes full of dazzled babies in them; and Whitehead, he came with great threatening of judgments upon me, they being so full of curses together that I can hardly tell what they said.'²

In a few days after the reciprocation of curses which has been described, Cole was ill. 'This,' says Muggleton, 'caused the Quakers' people to visit him very much, to know of him whether Muggleton's words had taken place in him, wondering that he should go out of the body so suddenly after Muggleton's sentence, as Thomas Loe did after his sentence. But he denied very stiffly that my words had no power over him, but that he had left me in chains of darkness. Nevertheless he grew worse and worse, so that the Quakers were not satisfied except he would go to the Peal in St. John's Street, at their Meeting-place, and give his testimony against Muggleton, before the people, to satisfy the ignorant Quakers, else they would judge that his Power in Loe and him was greater than the ministry of the Quakers. So they led him by the arms to the place aforesaid, and Josiah Cole wrote his Testimony, as followeth, exactly word for word.'³

But the story has become so strange that our readers may require some better evidence than that of one who has been introduced, and perhaps only known to them, as a mad and drunken tailor; and therefore we will give George Fox's account of the matter. He states that about an hour and a half before Cole died, he called on him, and having cleared the room of all other persons, asked him if 'anything did lie upon him to write' to Friends in England or elsewhere. To which Cole replied that 'he was clear of writing to them;' but he said 'that nothing did lie upon him.' 'He did understand that I had a book in answer to Muggleton, and that when he was gone, Muggleton and his company would boast against him; wherefore he desired that I would put a few words of his last Testimony against Muggleton in my book; and I bade him write them out, for I was to go to see a friend hard by, and would come to him presently again, and at that time as he was sitting

¹ Acts of Wit. p. 120.

² Sp. Epist. p. 243.

³ Ibid. p. 121.

'in his chair by the fire, he spoke them forth in the Power of the Lord God; as fresh as if he had ayed nothing, and a Friend took it in writing; which Testimony is inserted in the latter part of this book,' that is of 'The Books and Epistles of Josiah Coale,' already quoted.

One cannot read the Testimony without hoping that the design and execution of it did not rest entirely with the poor Josiah; especially as Alexander Parker's Testimonial, prefixed to the book, affirms 'he was full of love to the last.' It is not, we hope, uncharitable to remark that, according to his own account, Fox contrived to be alone with Cole when the thing was proposed, and to be absent from him when it was executed. The document, however, as he gives it, is as follows:—

'Forasmuch as I have been informed that Lodowick Muggleton hath vaunted concerning my departure out of the body, because of his pretended sentence of damnation given against me; I am moved to leave this Testimony, concerning him, behind me: viz. "That he is a son of darkness, and a co-worker with the Prince of the bottomless pit; in which his inheritance shall be for ever." And the judgment I passed on him, when with him, stands seal'd by the Spirit of the Lord, by which I then declar'd unto him, "That in the name of that God, that spanneth the heaven with his span, and measureth the waters in the hollow of his hand, I bind thee here on earth, and thou art bound in heaven; and in the chain under darkness to the Judgment of the great day thou shalt be reserved: and thy faith and strength, thou boastest of, I defie, and trample under foot." And I do hereby further declare the said Lodowick to be a false prophet, in what he said to me at that time, who told me, "That from henceforth I should be always in fear of damnation, which should be a sign to me, that I was damned;" which fear I was never in since; so that his sign given by himself did not follow his prophesie, which sufficiently declares him to be a false prophet.

'JOSIAH COALE.'

This testimony of Cole does not, however, appear to have been sufficient to satisfy the Quaker mind. But before we go further, we cannot help reminding the reader that the George Fox of whom we are reading, though the same person of whom we read before that he deserted his family and friends, is now full five and twenty years older. We are not looking at the rampant fanaticism of a wild peasant lad. Quakerism was not quite in its cradle in 1668, and those who had been in it half as long as it had existed, had had time to look about them, and consider. We make this remark because people sometimes seem to forget that the earliest years of a dynasty, a kingdom, or an institution of any kind, actually consisted of as many hours and minutes as the more recent ones; but as to the next of his correspondents, Muggleton says, 'In the same year came another thundering letter from a Lyon-like Quaker, being a learned man brought up at the University; his name is William

‘Pen; here is the copy of it verbatim.’¹ It is too long to be given entire, but part will suffice. After speaking of Coale, of his labours and impaired health, and charging Muggleton with having manifested an insulting spirit on his death, he says:—

‘I say, being sensible of thy vaunts, and it now being laid upon me, Therefore once more I come in the name and authority of that dreadful Majesty, which fills heaven and earth, to speak on this wise: Boast not, thou enemy of God, thou Son of Perdition, and Confederate with the unclean, croaking spirits reserved under chains to eternal darkness; for in the everlasting glorious Light thou despisest, thou art seen arraigned, tried, condemned and sentenced for a lying spirit, and false prophet, who, having counterfeited the commission and seal of that God, whom the Heaven cannot contain, hath bewitched a few poor silly souls; but their blood, oh! Muggleton, lies at thy door, and the wrath of the Almighty is kindled against thee, and his eternal Power in his servants the Quakers came, whom thou hast passed thy envious curse, shall suddenly grind thee to powder; and, as formerly, so again on the behalf of the God of the Quakers whom I worship, I boldly challenge thee, with thy six-foot God, and all the host of luciferian spirits, with all your commissions, curses, and sentences, to touch or hurt me; practice your skill and power! Behold, I stand in a holy defiance of all your enmity and strength: And this know oh! Muggleton, with thy God art chained, by the Spirit of the Lord, and on you I trample in his everlasting dominion, and to the bottomless pit are you sentenced, from whence you came, and where the endless worm shall know and torture your imaginary soul to eternity.

‘Written, signed, and sealed by commission, received about the first hour of the eleventh morning of the twelfth month 1668, from the glorious majesty of the Most High God, who fills heaven and earth, that lives in his servant,
 ‘WILLIAM PEN, Junior.’

However morally injurious any of these curses may have been when they ‘came back to roost,’ it will hardly be thought that they had power to hurt those against whom they were uttered. Josiah Coale seems to have been less terrible in fact, than in the brags of William Penn and the poetess. Muggleton and Whitehead can scarcely be supposed to have materially abbreviated each other’s lives. The former (notwithstanding the maledictions of his opponents, and worse dangers by Judge Jeffries and the pillory) reached his eighty-ninth year, and the latter his eighty-seventh.

The poor tailor, instead of being suddenly ground to powder, received—though not until after nearly four years—another letter from the Lyon-like Quaker, in a very different style and tone. Friends seem to have found that their way of going on did not answer; and William Penn—the only man, we believe, among them who could have dreamed of such a mode of proceeding—thought it might be well to try what a little show of argument and learning could do. Accordingly, he put forth a

¹ Acts of Wit. p. 125.

work entitled 'The New Witnesses proved Old Hereticks; or 'Information to the Ignorant,' &c.

In this work he undertook to show that the doctrines set forth as new discoveries by Reeve and Muggleton had been held in early times, and stigmatized as heretical. This, so far as his adversary was concerned, was a very gratuitous trouble. Muggleton said—and it would have been well if he had said nothing else, for it was his whole case in a nutshell, and put with admirable plainness, brevity, and candour—'For my part, 'I never saw any of those books he speaks of, neither did I ever 'read any of those points they condemn for heresy. We never 'read no books but the Bible.'

Without entering into the controversy, we may just observe that the letter, to which we have already alluded, is in the highest degree insulting and contemptuous; but it is not in the 'Ercles vein.' The fine gentleman, now in a state of transition into the learned polemic, is not going to 'tear a cat,' but only to explain why he has stooped to meddle with the creature. It begins:—

¹ Answer to Penn, p. 122.

It would, to be sure, have been better if they had occasionally consulted other books which have been written to illustrate the Bible. John Reeve understood the divine declaration, Genesis xi. 6—'Nothing will be restrained from them which they have *imagined* to do'—to imply an admission that the Babel-builders could (and would, if not restrained) have carried out their *imagination* of building a tower which should reach to heaven. As far as he knew, philosophers conceived that the clouds were about three miles from the earth; and he gave the men of Babel credit for knowing this by the eye; 'and so,' he went on 'they imagined that the firmament could not be above three miles higher,' or they could not have dreamed of making a tower to reach it. By these and other equally valid arguments, it seems, John Reeve endeavoured to persuade Mr. Richard Leader, a New England man somewhat addicted to astrology, that the heavens generally were not more than six miles from the earth. An account of the matter will be found in 'The Acts of the Witnesses,' p. 58, and 'The Stream from the Tree of Life,' p. 38. We do not see that Reeve said anything in particular of the *distance* of the sun; but here, and elsewhere, he maintained that it was not much greater than it appeared to be. In his 'Sacred Remains,' he says, (not very intelligibly) 'about the bigness of a square chamber' (p. 62, and see 92). We do not know that Muggleton ever expressed an opinion on any such point. As we notice this matter in reference to Lord Macaulay's statement, it is right to add that the discussion seems to have been carried on not only without cursing, but in the most friendly manner; and that Mr. Leader 'showed kindness unto John Reeve all the days of his life,' and also 'grew very mighty in wisdom and knowledge, both in natural and spiritual wisdom; so that every great man of his acquaintance did submit unto his wisdom, and lov'd him for his knowledge.'¹ The long and short of the matter is, that Lord Macaulay has mistaken one of these unhappy men for the other. It certainly is not very material; for we believe that any charges made against the moral character of either would be mere calumny. Their hallucination was lamentable, their heresies were absurd and detestable; but we believe that they were honest, sober, and industrious men.

¹ Acts of Wit. p. 61.

‘ L. Muggleton !

‘ The sense of thy ungodly and blasphemous practices (though otherwise an adversary of little moment), and their influence upon some poor, miserable, dark, and ignorant souls, begot in me a desire to detect thee, that being laid open to the view of such as foolishly think thy dreams and impostures worth a viewing, and which is worse, a believing too ; God may be justified in their judgment, and myself clear of their blood in the day of the Lord,’ &c.’

By the time that Penn wrote this, ‘ Friends ’ had ‘ lost the Power,’ which it never regained. What has since wandered about the world under the name of Quakerism, is but its ghost. Who that has seen, even in imagination, or Mrs. Greer’s description, Joseph John, and his sister Elizabeth, at Ennis-corthy, quite aground, and almost in fits, for want of four horses to draw their coach, would guess that they were the spiritual seed, and admiring followers, of the ‘ man in leathern breeches,’ who tramped barefoot through the snow, making ‘ stands,’ and crying, ‘ Woe to the bloody city of Lichfield.’ Yet who can doubt that if, while fighting for his leaders, Joseph John had been asked why he could not take off his hat, or say, ‘ good day,’ to Miss Strangman, he would have reverentially pointed to the *ipse dixit* of George Fox?

What can be more sad than the caricature of early zeal which remains among a body once so uncontrollably fervent. The same number of the *Friend*, which we have quoted respecting the Wellington hat-bands, contains a ‘ Testimony ’ of the monthly meeting of New York, concerning our beloved ‘ friend Elizabeth Coggeshall.’ It tells us, ‘ that this young married woman, about twenty-seven years of her age, became mightily impressed with an apprehension that it would be required of her to make a *religious visit to friends* in England, Ireland, and the continent of Europe.’ We give her full credit for godly sincerity when she says, that her ‘ strong will was much opposed ’ to public ministration, and speaks of it as a ‘ most solemn engagement, calling for such deep preparation of heart ! leading to such creaturely reduction.’ All things considered, one is really disposed to pity, more than we blame her, when she writes, ‘ After a time of deep heart-suffering, I was made willing to leave a sweet babe about thirteen months old, my beloved parents, and dear relatives and friends ; and in addition to this, I had not seen my affectionate husband for more than seven months ; but was enabled through the Lord’s

¹ Penn’s Works, vol. i. p. 46.

'holy aid and assistance, to leave my home with more fortitude than could have been expected.' A note informs us that her husband was a sea-faring man, who 'had expressed his approbation of her being faithful to this prospect of religious duty.' And we are afterwards told that, 'among the trials to which 'our dear friend, in inscrutable wisdom was subjected,' one was, 'that her husband sailed for England a short time before her return. In consequence of which, and of his absence at the time of her leaving home, they were separated about four years.'

But take it at its best, or its worst, what a poor thing is 'a religious visit to friends,' in these days. Think of the heroine 'whose name according to the world is Jane Stokes, 'who was commanded of the Lord for to go to the place where 'John Perrot was,'—that is, as he dated his letters, 'Rome Prison of madmen,'—and who did go 'in weakness and sore pains,' and 'entered into captivity,' being 'retained' by the Inquisition. Think of Isabel Buttery, who came from the north to London, dispersing George Fox's books, so that she was brought before the Lord Mayor, when 'her spirit was valiantly carried out,' insomuch that my Lord Mayor subjected her to 'creaturely reduction' in Bridewell. Think of our friends Katharine Evans and Sarah Chevers, when the 'drawings in their minds to travel towards Alexandria,'¹ got them into the Maltese dungeons, and they were lying on the floor of their cell to suck in air under the door, while Gilbert and Lord Obaney were compassing their enlargement; and they too had husbands and children; and beside letters to the inquisitor and Friar Malachy, Katharine wrote one prodigiously long one, which is directed, 'For the hands of John Evans, my right dear and precious husband, with my tender-hearted children, 'who are more dear and precious to me than the apple of mine eye.' Think of Mary Fisher, 'a religious maiden,' who has been already mentioned, and who might have been introduced as having been one of the first couple of Quakeresses who landed in New England, before she 'found herself concerned to 'go with a message from the Lord, as she believed, to Sultan 'Mahomet the Fourth,'²—and how when she came to Adrianople, she acquainted some of the citizens with her intent, and desired them to go with her, but they not daring so to do, for fear of the Sultan's displeasure, she went to the camp alone, and procured information to be made at the Grand Vizier's tent, that there was an English woman who had something to

¹ Sew. 293.

² Besse II. 394.

declare from the Great God to the Sultan; who sent her word that she should speak with him the next morning. So she returned to the city that night, and next morning went back to the camp, when the Sultan being with his great men about him, as he uses to be when he receives ambassadors, sent for her in, and asked her, whether it was so as he had heard, viz. that she had a message from the Lord? She answered, 'Yea.' Then he bade her speak on (having three interpreters by him), and when she stood silent a little, waiting on the Lord when to speak, he, supposing that she might be fearful to utter her mind before them all, asked her, 'Whether she desired that any of them might go forth before she spake?' She answered 'Nay.' Then he bade her speak the word of the Lord to them, and not to fear, for they had good hearts, and could hear it, and strictly charged her to speak the word she had to say from the Lord, neither more nor less, for they were willing to hear it be it what it would. Then she speaking, they all gave diligent attention with much seriousness and gravity till she had done; and then the Sultan asked her, 'Whether she had any more to say?' She asked, 'Whether he understood what she had said?' He replied, 'Yea, every word,' adding, that it was truth, and desired her to stay in that country, saying, 'that they could not but respect such an one, as had taken so much pains to come to them so far as from England, with a message from the Lord, and offered her a guard to bring her to Constantinople, whither she intended to go,' which she not accepting, but trusting in the arm of the Lord, who had brought her safe thither, to conduct her back again, he told her, 'It was dangerous travelling, especially for such an one as she, and wondered that she had passed safe so far as she had, saying, it was respect and kindness to her, that he had offered her a guard, and that he would not for any thing that she should come to the least hurt in his dominions.' . . . And so she departed through that great army to Constantinople without a guard, and came thither without the least hurt, scorn or derision; the Turks in this behalf receiving her and her message with far more respect and civility than she had often met with from those who covered themselves with a profession of Christianity.

Such things as we have already said, really were 'peculiarities;' but we must not let such comparisons draw us into a discussion of modern Quakerism. A strong feeling is abroad, and rather a brisk controversy has been raised. Whether

'Young Quakerism' of the nineteenth century will be able to break the yoke imposed on it by 'Young Quakerism' of the seventeenth, remains to be seen. Should it succeed, may it be in sobriety, and the fear of God; and may the grotesque imagery of, perhaps, the most grotesque hero-worship that has ever prevailed, be cleared off in a way becoming those who profess to be lovers of peace and good-will to men. In the mean time, we must repeat that the matter cannot be understood, or fairly dealt with, either by those within or those without the pale of the Society, who have not bestowed some inquiry and reflection on the origin and the originators of the peculiarities.

- ART. II.—1. *Collections of the Massachusetts Historical Society.* First, Second, and Third Series. Boston, U.S.
2. *The Virginians.* By W. M. THACKERAY. Bradbury and Evans. 1859.
3. *Life of George Washington.* By WASHINGTON IRVING. John Murray. 1857.
4. *Mary Howitt's History of the United States of America.* Longman and Co. 1859.

SOME countries, like some wines, become old and mellow, or rapid and effete, as it may be, with age, while others, their contemporaries, are now effervescing with youth. How few there are of the Englishmen who read, think, or talk of America, with its bustling freedom, and somewhat parvenu-like ostentation of prosperity, who linger in thought for a moment on a portion of that seemingly ever new country, now heavy and worn down with all the corruptions of an European empire. Yet Virginia, the Old Dominion, exhibits as varied a series of national fortunes, and as full a development of social and political character, as any ancient realm in our hemisphere. Long and doubtful was its struggle into life. Storms seemed to blow which have never raged since, and new forms of disease were discovered, as though to balance, in proper tragic antithesis, the Eden-like beauties which revealed themselves to the admiring eyes of North Devon mariners. The contrast is a strange one between the glory and luxuriant beauty of these southern regions of the New World, as presenting themselves to the eyes of the first discoverers, and the aspect which they showed to the same men become regular residents, and no longer casual guests. The sunny air is a parching Arabian atmosphere; the zephyrs, sharp withering breezes; pleasant, shadowy woods, gloomy jungles; and bright flowers, the poor apologies for west country grain and orchards.

It was only after many calamitous expeditions, equipped under the auspices of one of those heroes of our history who hover strangely between the King Arthurs and the Marlboroughs, between romance and prose, Sir Walter Raleigh, the gallant who spoiled a cloak, and the somewhat jesuitical co-plotter with atheists and seminary priests, that at length a little village slowly emerged on the banks of the broad James. But still fresh bands of eager adventurers flocked in. In vain they met their predecessors in full retreat, despairing and disgusted, their harvests grubbed up, and their huts in ruins.

As they floated up those glorious Virginian estuaries, they forgot all evil auspices. 'Their senses were ravished,' writes one of themselves, 'with the beauty of the prospect, the 'fragrancy of fields and gardens, the brightness of the sky, and 'serenity of the air,' till they exclaimed that no two European realms could approach the rich abundance and luxuriance of this. The flaunting crown imperial, the cardinal flower, the mocassin flower, and the tulip tree, were on every side; not in gardens, but in the woods, running wild. Malochotons and cherries and peaches were there, too many for any but the hogs to eat; and, in short, 'scarce a flower or a fruit exists, which 'does not flourish better in Virginia than even its own native 'soil.' Gradually, even wealth poured in. The scent of that dreary looking weed, tobacco, began to loom full on the European palate. The Grand Turk and the Tartars of Samarcand themselves appreciated the discovery. The Virginian Company condescended, though reluctantly, to 'this degradation of the Virginian glebe,' relinquishing grand visions of rivalry with Potosi, Italian silkworms, and French vineyards; and James I. gave up devoting his leisure to 'Blasts, and Counterblasts,' abandoned his paternal fears lest 'one hundred thousand English rustics should smoke at the plough,' and betook himself to the more serious task of devising how to turn the new taste into the most profitable vehicle of taxation.

Before the Revolution, the social condition of the tide-water region of Virginia was well known to the merchants of Liverpool and Bristol, who were often the guests of the planters on the shores of those great highways, the James and the Potomac. We do not possess that knowledge. The present highways and railways pass far on one side of this once famous territory. Guide-books totally ignore it; and even Americans themselves seem scarcely to understand the nature of this division of Virginia, or its inhabitants. While the whole land has lost its pre-eminence in the Union, this district has in its own State lost its relative rank. Formerly, it was everything; and its history the history of Virginia. It included the shores of the great rivers for a couple of hundred miles, or more, into the interior, and was fringed with spacious mansions, up to the very doors of which frigates could sail, and great merchantmen, with the fashions of London to exchange for the renowned sweet Virginian tobacco. Even the sea-breezes showed it favouritism; they were then never felt above Williamsburg; now they are welcomed, at close of midday, in the hot woods, on the slopes of the first mountains. Out of the whole number of members returned to the first Congress by the State, a great majority came from

thence ; now it sends but an inconsiderable minority. Thence sprang all the leading men, foremost in the Union as in Virginia, of the epoch of the Revolution, and there they lived. Patrick Henry himself, the practical Radical and democrat, dwelt just on its verge. Now all that is changed. The life and vigour of the land, as seen at least in politics, has oozed away from the tidal territory. Tobacco, the staple of Virginian trade and wealth, requires a virgin soil (though the peasant proprietor of the Bergstrasse cannot, apparently, afford to hold any such doctrine), and so the capitalist is ever removing farther and farther into the interior. His exhausted plantation he leaves to become a wilderness of cedars, oaks, wild vines, tulip and judas trees, strawberries, azaleas, and roses, pasturage for hosts of butterflies and humming-birds. The West receives the owner, or the region beyond the barrier of the Blue Mountains, which then, as being occupied by Irishmen, interposed an insuperable obstacle to the fastidious Virginian planter. New counties were, even in those historical times of the land, ever in process of formation in the West. Thus, Albemarle had originally been a portion of Gooch County, and the latter, the native district of Jefferson, itself a fragment of another.

A further explanation may be, that, though the great men of Virginia previously and in the earlier times of the Revolution did condescend to interfere in politics, the hope of real influence and power has now drifted so far beyond their principles and sort of statesmanship that, in common with the rest of their own rank in the Union, they are not heard of, not because they have ceased to exist, but because they no longer take the same interest in national politics which they once took in affairs in which their counsels were paramount. Neither the mass of native Americans, nor wandering tourists know of their habits of life and thought, because the former have no opportunity of studying them in the arena of Congress, while the ebbing of tobacco cultivation, and of curiosity towards the West leads the latter also off in that direction. But, along the course of these mighty streams, may still be seen 'large piles of irregular architecture, and quaint turrets and gables, which we think more 'consonant to the oak and beech, among the hickory, black 'walnut, and acacia.' The same broad fields, and farms deserving the name of manors, still surround them ; and many old names linger about. The estates in this region continue, spite of the repeal of the law of entails, to have the proportions of great English domains, many containing ten thousand acres. They are cultivated by great gangs of negroes, and the houses are filled with servants.

Though the land is generally poor, the course of the

great rivers and their tributaries is marked by a fertile strip of country, sown now usually with maize, cotton, and palma Christi, and bounded, at a mile's distance, by the dreary forests of interminable black pitch-pine. This is more peculiarly the character of the James. Forty-three miles from its source it is fourteen miles broad, a sort of inland sea indeed. The edging of dark fir and cedar of various sombre tints on its shores appears, at first, to grow out of the water; so low is the surrounding level. After a time, the banks, still at a great elevation, begin to display soil of a good quality, covered thickly with the mulberry, walnut, and sycamore. Every now and then a great house comes into view, and, as though the whole land were not a vast forest round about, one is sure to find planted by English-squire's instincts dreary columns of Lombardy poplars. The Potomac flows through more picturesque scenery; and the magnificent falls bordered by huge black cliffs, a combination of Alpine grandeur with tropical vegetation, its great bluffs and long wooded ridges throwing massy shadows over the broad silent river on towards the rich shores of Maryland, make the mind forget the Dutch-like prospects in the lower district. It does not, however, water a larger breadth of fertile land on the whole. All through those flat alluvial regions stretches the broad belt of Pine Barrens, running parallel to the coast through the Atlantic Plain, overspread with gigantic long-tufted firs. Wherever they give way, are found swamps clothed richly with evergreen oak and cypress, with wild vines clinging round the trunks, and their branches hung with the white berries of the misletoe. The largest has the famous name of the Great Dismal. It is forty miles long and fifteen broad, and is described as looking like an inundated river plain, the water vibrating with a sort of mysterious current, and the whole fen being higher than the dry land round. Great trunks of fallen trees lie beneath a dense deposit of peat in the interior, and a rich carpet of moss spreads over the surface. The efforts of Washington set on foot a series of canals through the midst; and now and then a boat emerges from under the overarching aisles into the central lake, Drumond's Pool, while the occasional snarl of a wolf, and the crash of boughs dragged down by a bear in quest of acorns, blends mysteriously with the sighing of the cedars.

The very barrenness of the chief part of the district, and the narrow limits within which all industry was confined, cherished, as though in a hothouse, the prosperity of the tide-water plantations. They were kept perforce to the very bounds within which the stir of trade could most readily find them. In the days of Governor Berkeley, and partly in consequence of the sympathy between the settlers and that fiery old cavalier, this

region had become rich and prosperous. In 1649, we learn from a description of the settlement given by a gentleman in a letter to a friend in England, that it had so increased as then to contain 15,000 English, including the king's occasional presents to the Company of a hundred or two of 'dissolute persons,' and 300 negroes. There were 2,000 head of cattle, and swine ranging the woods innumerable. Thirty ships, with a complement in all of a thousand sailors, sailed up the estuaries in autumn, returning with their freight of tobacco in March. The land was full of valuable timber, often sixty feet high and three square, with no underwood, so that the cumbrous coaches-and-six of the period could make their way through the forest. Already the orchards, in parts, had begun to bear as richly as in Herefordshire, and cider was added to the excellent metheglin, the result of the flowers which the bees, we are assured, found, notwithstanding their brightness and pretentiousness, 'most excellent food.' So late as Oldmixon's time, about the close of the seventeenth century, when the population had now grown to 70,000, pork 'the best in the world,' and capons, might be had almost for the asking, and deer sold at eight shillings the head. It was reckoned that the tobacco trade was at the latter period carried on in fifty ships in the year from Liverpool alone, and in the same, or a yet larger number from Bristol, which paid on their cargoes 60,000*l.* to the revenue yearly, while at least a hundred sailed from the Thames.

In such a land capital soon made its weight felt, and the richest portions of the country on the banks of each of the four great rivers were soon parcelled out among from ten to thirty planters dwelling in ample houses, not much farther apart than in a rural district of the mother-country; and there keeping open house, 'every one's contempt falling upon the sordid wretch who should offend against that laudable custom of the country,' says Oldmixon. 'In England,' he continues, 'a hospitable man is reckoned a sot or a bubble, and hearty feasts are thought disreputable. But not so among the prudent, careful (*sic*), generous, hospitable people of Virginia.' Of this class, so early as 1649, was 'that worthy Captain Matthews, one of the council, and a most deserving *Commonwealth's man* (not necessarily one in arms against King Charles), who hath a fine house, and keeps weavers and a tan-house, with eight shoemakers, and forty negro servants, whom he brings up to trade. His wheat he selleth at four shillings the bushel, kills store of beeves, and sells them to victual the ships, hath abundance of kine, and a brave dairy.' In fine, 'with his wife, the daughter of Sir Thomas Hamilton, he keeps a good house, lives bravely, is a true lover of Virginia, and is

‘worthy of much honour.’—*New State of Virginia*. Such were the hearty merchant-farmers of Virginia of the first generation, with some of the refinements of courtiers conjoined with the adventurousness of West of England mariners. In his own ships and from his own wharves the rich land-owner laded for Bristol the full tobacco crop grown on his own lands. Meantime, he entertained nobly at his house the merchant or supercargo the whole winter through, gathering up tales of popular resistance to prerogative at home.

He was as keen a champion of popular rights as any feudal baron struggling for Magna Charta, or a Derbyshire or Cheshire squire fretting under the sway of a Chatsworth or an Eaton. His views of the *denotation* of those popular rights and liberties were much the same as theirs. It is indeed very hard to take in at a glance both sides of his character. The planters, more particularly those of the second generation, formed a sort of nation of De Medici merchants; men, that is, spending on pleasure and luxury the profits, and often something more, of a hundred adventures; and while in the relation to one set of men of liberal democratic traders, holding to another that of despots and task-masters. The spectacle of a Leicestershire fox-hunter, overseeing a troop not only of negroes, but of whites, now convicts from the hulks, now cavaliers, Commonwealth men, or Jacobites, whichever cause was uppermost in England, would not be a pleasant *tableau*. It was bad enough at all events. But these careless Transatlantic squires, who loved no sport in which the dangers of a fox-chase were not exaggerated, hunting wild horses in the interval of a drinking-bout, and dashing about over roads as bad as English highways in the reigns of the Stuarts, and of which the streets of New Norfolk, with mud so copious as to float a boat, would even now be a kind of type, managed to keep the two characters agreeably apart, by transferring, with the very easiest of consciences, all of the slave-owner’s attributes, but his profits, to their bailiffs, clerks, and stewards. They themselves, far from brandishing the whip, were discussing, over thrice-voyaged madeira, or strong Cheshire ale, or in the Parliament-house of Williamsburg, or its many coffee-houses, the equality of man, and the limits of prerogative.

Above all, they were opposed to anything like centralization. This was their great bugbear, both before the Revolution and after it. They are now always keeping watch and ward over menaced motions for improving a road, or building a bridge in their State. Formerly the establishment of fixed *dépôts* of trade was their pet object of aversion and assault. In vain did Charles II. command Governor Berkeley to get a law passed in the Colonial Legislature for all ships to unlade at Jamestown, and for the

building of forts for that purpose, and to guard against breaches of the Act of Navigation. Both merchants and planters were obstinately opposed to any such policy. The former knew that it would not be for their interest that great marts should arise, at which the growers might lessen the real intensity of the demand for the tobacco crop, instead, as under the then system, of being entirely dependent on the bid of a single ship-owner, who had obtained a monopoly, in many cases, by lending large sums on the security of the harvest for many years to come. They were also disinclined to resign their very pleasant sojourn of three or four months amid the luxuries of a planter's mansion. A well-introduced tourist may still, in Virginia, test the force of this latter motive. The planters, on the other hand, were, on their estates, as absolutely independent as an old Norman lord of a manor. Each estate had its appropriate name, not being called, as in the north, such and such a lot in such a township. They went up to the seat of government to spend the season together, to dine merrily at taverns, and to fête or be fêted by a popular nobleman and his wife. But they were as averse to resign their squirearchical rank for that of regular residents in a small country town, as would be a set of Highland lairds or English county families.

They hated the appearance of centralization: and nothing in appearance with less of centralization could have existed than the Virginian system. The Governor or his deputy lived in a palace, had his guards, titles, and a salary liberal enough to tempt English peers. He could veto acts of the Assembly, and appoint colonels of militia, and lords-lieutenant of counties. He was lord-general, and high admiral, chancellor, chief justice, and his own prime minister. Yet no government could be less of an absolutism than that in its practical working. The whole body of planters had, it is true, a species of national pride in the name of Virginians, and they manifested an apathy, which betrayed even a secret pleasure, whenever the tobacco trade of rival Maryland, or the commerce of New York or New England was supposed to be in peril. But, virtually, at least so far as they cared for aught beyond the verge of their estates, their cares were bounded by their several counties, and the county *régime* was modelled in the way to gratify their dislike of the very appearance of dependence. The county courts of Virginia certainly appear, even at the present time, till we have got a clear insight into the character of Virginian democracy, an anomaly in the constitution of that State. 'The number of magistrates composing them,' we learn from a native writer (Tucker) on political economy and government, 'is kept up from persons nominated by the courts themselves. It is true that the exe-

‘cutive of the State has the power of rejecting the nominations of the county courts; but, as the public necessity for the magistrates may be very pressing, and as the motives to reject can seldom be so strong as to induce the executive power to put itself into collision with the court, the recommendation is virtually an appointment. There has not been a rejection perhaps in one case in a thousand. The consequence is, that the power is substantially possessed by the courts, and is concentrated in a few families, who naturally endeavour to strengthen and perpetuate their influence and authority. They have criminal jurisdiction in all cases of misdemeanor, the power of acquittal in all cases of felony, the power of nominating, which is equivalent to that of appointing, all militia officers below the rank of brigadiers, and of making all the lucrative county appointments, as well as to fill up the vacancies in their own body; the high sheriff is taken from the body every two years, and then returns to it; they have the power of levying poll taxes for county purposes; they establish or put down all the roads and bridges. There is no individual in the county who may not be made to feel their power or ill will.’ And yet ‘the great mass of State politicians regard these oligarchical courts as the anchor of safety to the State, which has hitherto kept her to her moorings, in spite of the shifting currents of opinion, and would keep her against the driving tempest of popular fury.’ The institution is, in fact, a matter of boast and pride to the Virginians; and this, as far as we can see, simply on account of the institution being a peculiarity of their country.

It was not by standing forward boldly as the people’s representatives, that the great Virginian houses attained their influence. It was their own by right of property. In many cases they were most unpopular with the yeomanry, ‘philip-pizing,’ says Jefferson, somewhat in a partisan spirit, ‘in every collision between king and people, with a view to a seat in the council,’ so that after the Revolution made their ancestral honours a reproach, ‘a Randolph, a Carter, or a Burwell must have great personal superiority over a common competitor to be elected even at this day.’ Few great Virginian planters had made their own fortunes. Fortune-making was no quality which flourished on Virginian soil. It was enough if they kept what family interest at home had procured for them by lavish royal grants. It is all very well for Oldmixon, that notorious perverter of facts, to declaim about there being ‘no need of a Heralds’ Office at Jamestown, the honest merchant and industrious planter being the men of honour in Virginia.’ He himself confesses, that when the condition of

the settlement began to improve, 'many men of small fortunes but good families, came out.' There was country gentleman's blood in their veins, and the instinct in their hearts, that the serious business of life for their class was pleasure. They defied royal governors and orders of Boards of Trade, when the question was between them and these,—but it was quite otherwise when the other relations of society were the subject of controversy. Both Oldmixon and Defoe confound Maryland and Virginia. The latter even declares, in 'Colonel Jack,' that 'Maryland is Virginia, speaking of them from a distance.' In the former indeed it was different; but in Virginia, those who began life as yeomen seem to have, as a rule, always left to their descendants the same status; and so it was with the great planters.

It was in right of their apparent possessions and landed interest, and, in short, the prestige of their ancestors' wealth, that they maintained their pre-eminence, and not of their actual riches. The great families of the country received but few accessions from within, to compete with and outshine them. Their estates were eaten up with all the cancers of an old landed system, which they had imported with them from England to a new world. They were burdened with many mortgages, liens, settlements on younger children, elegits, statutes, and the like, while they were generally so fast tied up that the soil could never get freed by passing into other hands. The possessors themselves might be treated with the greatest insolence by the merchants, their guests, and creditors, who were in a very different state of discipline to that which they were subject to in New England. But, as between themselves and their countrymen, they maintained their superiority as fully and freely as ever Irish landowner besieged in his dilapidated castle, before the iron age of the Encumbered Estates Court. They bore their dignity by no means meekly. If, in these days, northerners are forced to confess that, though the majority, 'they are held in political thralldom by the southern planters,' from the greater leisure the latter can devote to matters fruitless in dollars, than the small farmers and merchants of New York and New England, and also from their superior power of 'banding together as one man in defence of what they call 'their property and institutions, their general eloquence and 'political tact, and the high bearing, which often imposes on 'northern men, much superior to them in real talent, knowledge, and strength of character' (Sir Charles Lyell), much more was this the case in those old times, when they had only the lower orders of their fellow Virginians to domineer over. At home they saw none but courteous or complaisant guests,

obsequious overseers, or silent bondsmen, of whom they occasionally held a levée, seated on high, as Defoe describes it, in a large hall, 'like a lord judge on the bench, or a petty king on his throne!' The interests of the first were the same with their own, and they only met as they still do to sympathise in an outcry against the Government, or to dance away the long summer evenings. The last they ruled with a rod of iron; for these jovial olive-hued squires could, without a thought, commit the extreme power of torture into the hands of men proverbially cruel. They did not concern themselves with the fate of the last purchase from the convict-ship. It might sometimes be an abandoned fellow, sent to contaminate the tobacco-fields; sometimes a chivalrous gentleman from Preston, transported for the very cause planters loved to drink on their knees success to. Sometimes it might even be a kidnapped child, or honest peasant. They recked not. To neighbours not of the same degree with their own they behaved with extreme hauteur. The *half-breeds*, as the biographer of Patrick Henry assures us, the younger scions of great families were styled, were just admitted within the circle, not as members, but appendages. The integral constituents of the order formed a true oligarchy, defined, that is, by wealth as well as birth. The few who had raised themselves from a servile, or at all events from a dependent condition, could not hope to be admitted till, by the third generation, they had purged away the stain of their ancestors' honest exertions. The substantial independent yeomanry, 'looking askance at, but not jostling their betters,' were treated by their chiefs as only made to pay taxes.

In reference to tax-paying liabilities, this aristocracy claimed no foremost place. While appealing ever to their wealth (itself often a fiction) as their title to power, they provided for the public expenditure by a capitation tax; the expense, a heavy one, of making the roads was borne equally by all males over sixteen. They absorbed a considerable portion of the income when collected. By having the right of suffrage limited to freeholders, they insured, for the most part, the return of the nominees of themselves. There was as fine a show of the recognition of popular privileges at an election of a burgess as in Westmoreland. There was a great deal of band-playing, and a vast amount of drinking at the candidates' expense; but the poorer freeholders were so generally as deep in debt to the richer, who were in the habit of supplying them with goods imported by them, as were these to the merchants, that the free choice was a mere farce. The leading landowners selected *their* representatives, and then they paid them out of the contributions of the masses an exorbitant remuneration for devoting

their time to defending their own monopoly against the prerogative of the Crown as represented by the Governor. During the reign of Charles I., when the aristocracy was entirely absolute, the salary was, for each day of attendance, 150 lbs. of tobacco (the common currency of the tide-water region), and 100 lbs. more for the maintenance of a horse and servant; that is, altogether, about twenty-five dollars daily. It is manifest that it was only actual dread of the official and territorial influence of the aristocracy which kept them at the head of affairs, and not a feeling of affection, from the circumstance that one of the chief complaints of young Colonel Bacon, in his insurrectionary manifesto, was based on this extravagantly high salary. They retorted, no doubt with much truth, that his object,—one of themselves as he was by birth and fortune,—was the selfish one of obtaining a monopoly of the Indian trade. Governor Berkeley, who, we are told, ruled as ‘a Governor with a landed interest,’ made common cause with the aristocrats; but the Royal Commissioners sent out to examine into the causes of the rebellion reported so decidedly against the amount, that it was reduced. It still, however, continued so high as to be a perpetual source of murmuring among the farmers, and a good electioneering cry for the Crown. Thus, James II., on a recommendation from the Privy Council being rejected by the Assembly, took care to insinuate that the contumacy of that body arose partly from a wish to prolong the session for the sake of the pay, and commanded that this popular charge should be read in all the churches. In the same way they monopolized the not directly very lucrative honours of the Council; they accepted them, not as a pledge of submission to Government, but rather as an acknowledgment of their rank and power; very few of them were, their adversaries allow, Tories, *i. e.* supporters of prerogative. But the Council was the avenue to various lucrative posts, such as the Auditorship, endowed with an income of $7\frac{1}{2}$ per cent. of public money; the Treasurership, with 6 per cent. of all passing through that office; the Presidentship of the Council, and place of Attorney-General. And we find, accordingly, Dudley Digges, Randolph, Byrd, Robinson, and other aristocratic names perpetually associated with them.

It is not pleasant to discover that these gentlemen of high bearing, who have ever been renowned for so nice a sense of honour that even strangers find it rather a hard thing to avoid a suggestion of a recourse to pistols or bowie-knives, not content with distributing between their thousands of acres, and a farm of fifty, the charges for the support of administration, while they had themselves the lion's share in the expenditure,

were not ashamed to pillage the public secretly. The Speaker of the Assembly, who was also, by virtue of his office, Colonial Treasurer for the twenty-five years preceding 1765, was Robinson, the acknowledged head of the landed aristocracy, with a keen love of pomp and titles, but popular and courteous (that is, of course, to his equals). It was he who addressed the celebrated compliment to Washington, when utterly confounded, and incapable of uttering a single word in reply to the House of Burgesses' vote of thanks for his military services, after Braddock's defeat. Party management was his pride, and to get a vote he did not scruple to lend, on personal security, large sums of public money to these embarrassed trading squires. In the year 1765, however, this upright statesman felt a crisis was approaching. All his own private means were exhausted, and he had the impudence, backed by that of the tide-water oligarchs, to propose the establishment of a State Loan Office, with the intention of entering the old transactions as new ones. It was only by the eloquence of Patrick Henry, who, without impeaching the honesty of the powerful Speaker, excited the jealousy of the members from the upper counties, and laid up for himself a future tempest of hatred on the part of the aristocracy, that the iniquitous scheme was defeated. The next year Robinson died, irremediably insolvent, and, it was discovered, indebted to the Treasury 100,000 dollars.

These same were the men who, at least consistent in selfishness, lived in splendour, while they consoled their neighbours who in every creek starved on shell-fish, with the fact that they were not slaves of the Crown, and who, amidst professions of rigid orthodoxy, plundered the revenue of the Church. Far into the seventeenth century, only one chapel existed in Virginia. But their enthusiasm was only of a negative character; they had early got the right to induct transferred from the Crown to the vestries, which were formed by cooptation of the twelve leading men of the parish. They availed themselves of their power to keep the rectory in law vacant, letting church and parsonage fall into decay, while they allowed the officiating clergyman so humble a stipend, out of the very liberal provision made at the establishment of the Colony, that he was forced, in most cases, to eke it out by keeping a school. The Assembly itself sympathised with this policy, which had for its apparent object the curbing of any disagreeable disposition on the part of a minister to reprove his wealthy parishioners' morals, and, in fact, had guaranteed their charges to the defendants in the famous cause, when 'Patrick Henry plead against the parsons,' as the country still remembers.

Altogether no favourable impression is produced on the mind

by contemplating the social and political aspects of the tide-water districts. The planters were selfish, indolent, and rapacious. They did not even possess the idea of comfort. Their domestic architecture so offended Jefferson's ultra-classical taste, which took refuge in an admiration for Philadelphian neatness, that he exclaims, 'The genius of architecture seems to have shed its malediction over this land.' Its clumsiness, if indicative of wealth and comfort, would not rouse English instincts against it. But it only betrayed ostentation. It is in vain that we look in this, the old Virginia, for traces of rural ease and tastes. There we find no orchards or bright flower-gardens, no dairies or lawns; no neat farm-houses, as in New England. Every acre they had sufficient slave-labour to cultivate was used for the growth of tobacco, to supply the demands of rapacious English creditors. It was only by the law of entail, and the assistance they managed to obtain from the State Treasury, that they were maintained in their hereditary position. The former had been, very soon after the planting of the colony, imported from England, along with many other legal traditions, by the younger sons of families which had grown up under its shadow. Now such men accept colonial offices, or emigrate, but always with the distinct intention of spending a long residue of life in the neighbourhood of Pall Mall. Then, on a healthier principle, perhaps, they went to found a family which should flourish side by side, as it were, with the English stock. There were many Colonel Esmonds in those old times. Almost as a necessary consequence, they introduced entails, to ensure the transmission of their name and memory. At first, they could, as at home, be barred, and the property alienated; but by the end of the seventeenth century, it was discovered that the old cavalier spirit had become so rampant and triumphant as to have completely driven beyond the Chesapeake, into Maryland, and the North, the industry proper to a new country. Mortgages were in such headlong process of eating up the vast domains with which noble families had been endowed by the Crown, that it was apparent that, in a short time, the whole land would have passed into the hands, not of their more provident fellow Virginians, but of a small guild of merchants. These were in the habit, writes Jefferson to Lister Asquith, of accommodating their reckless host with loan upon loan, and then, 'having got him immersed in debt, they reduced the price given for his tobacco; so that, let his shipments be ever so great, and his demand of necessaries ever so economical, they never permitted him to clear it off, the debts becoming hereditary from father to son for many generations, so that the planters were a species of property annexed to certain mercantile houses.' Even after the Revolution, the same

state of things existed, and Virginians, themselves by no means guiltless in this respect, lament it freely. The same statesman, whilst himself indulging, to the ruin of his private means and family respectability, in a love of the fine arts and of hospitality, writes regretfully from Paris, where he was ambassador, declaring that 'he looked back to the war as a time of happiness, when we could not run in debt, because nobody would trust us, when we practised, of necessity, the maxim of buying nothing but what we had money in our pockets to pay for,—a maxim which, of all others, lays the broadest foundation for happiness.' Under these circumstances, in the year 1705, the custom of docking entails, as it is called, that is, a way of restoring to the tenant the free control over the estate, was expressly prohibited, and thus the land bound up for ever with the family, unless the Legislature chose, as a favour to an individual possessor, to set it free. The effect was, that the careless prodigality of a planter's establishment was bounded only by his honesty, or personal credit, a very scanty security indeed for a creditor.

The contest initiated by Jefferson and Patrick Henry, for the abolition of the doctrine of entail with all its incidents, including, above all, this last, and also that of primogeniture, opened the eyes of the Virginian aristocracy to the nature of the struggle then commencing. In New England, the main object of the Revolution was to break the bond of dependence on the mother-country. In Virginia this was, indeed, one motive; but it was inseparably connected with another, and that was, as its own supporters phrased it, 'the substitution of an aristocracy of virtue and talent for the aristocracy of birth and wealth.' Few of the old aristocracy could be called Tories. Even adversaries, who hated the system, speak of 'only half-a-dozen aristocratic gentlemen, angry at the loss of their pre-eminence, venting their indignation at the change from a monarchy to a republic, and more worthy of pity than punishment.' But the main perplexity of the old families arose from the fact that they found the natural support of their own dignity to be the throne they had ever insulted, and could not now bring themselves to aid in re-establishing. This inconsistency was the weak point in their fortress. Men like the Randolphs had been Whigs, or more, for generations. They found themselves suddenly in the position of a Lord John Russell outbidden by a John Bright. They had resisted the Court, or Governor's party with a self-approbation the most sincere. They had travelled to London, and intrigued in the purlieus of Whitehall for a century. All this had been in the interests of their own order. They were bitterly indignant at men who now demanded for

themselves a share in the glory of patriotism, and still more fiercely suspicious when they found them impertinently interfering in matters which concerned the disposition of the private property of their old chiefs. Such houses, which had long arrogated a monopoly of popularity, were the Randolphs, Flemings, Says, Eldridges, and Murrays, all of renown in the State, and in right of their descent from the fair Princess Pocahontas, princes of the blood royal of Virginia, as James I. intimated they should be accounted. They could point to portions of their estates as having once formed part of the royal demesne of that Indian emperor and puissant English baron, Powhatan. Another member of the coterie was the family of Digges, whose representative made it a point of pride always to receive George Washington, himself not averse, with all his modesty, to fine clothes and splendid equipages, on the broad bosom of the Potomac, in a barge of English make, rowed by six negroes in black velvet caps and checked shirts.

It is a redeeming trait in the history of the order, and one proof that it was not altogether vicious, that, when they found they must either abandon their old principles of political, and as they thought it, patriotic opposition, and desert to the side of the English Government, or else acquiesce in the destruction of many of their own cherished privileges, they did not choose the course of apparent expediency for a single moment. Further, though the whole system which they had instituted in Virginia had been doubtless bad, cumbrous, and effete, yet it is equally plain that, under it, the land reached, and for some time maintained, a pre-eminence, relatively to the rest of the New World, which it cannot now understand it has lost. It furnished a great revenue to the mother-country; it consumed a large quantity of its most elaborate and expensive products; it furnished it and the world at large with luxuries, which have been by general use almost converted into necessities. In the land itself there was a lavish display of wealth, not much comfort or good taste it is true, but, on the shores of glorious sea-floods rushing up far inland between majestic forests, a succession of noble villas, and wharves crowded with shipping. The aspect of the country was that of a Liverpool broken up, and spread up and down a hundred miles or so of estuary. To see that the country was eaten up with debt, and the prey of extravagance, it was necessary to wander farther, and examine more closely. We are told by a native Virginian (Professor Tucker), that Jefferson's laws have promoted the distribution of wealth, that 'a much larger number of those who are wealthy have acquired their wealth by their own talents or enterprise; and 'most of these last are commonly content with reaching the

'average of that more moderate standard of expense which public opinion requires, rather than the higher scale which it tolerates.' Again, that 'there were formerly many in Virginia who drove a coach-and-six, now such an equipage is never seen; that there were probably twice or three times as many four-horse carriages before the Revolution as there are at present; but the number of two-horse carriages may be now ten or even twenty times as great as at the former period;' that 'a few families could boast of more plate than can now be met with; but the whole quantity in the country has increased twenty if not fifty fold.' However this may be, it is certain that Virginia is now one of the worst conditioned and least flourishing members of the Union, though with a territory possessed of the most extraordinary natural advantages for trade, and that it was then far the foremost; that finally, it is with a sort of pitying contempt that the western and northern populations hear of demands made by their old chief for reverence which is only paid, if at all, to its history, and not to itself. At all events, an increase in national wealth, confessedly effected by adventitious capital from the north, can scarcely be adduced as evidence of the superiority of the new times to the old, when the south of the Chesapeake was celebrated exclusively for its civilization and luxury. The fact, that farmers from Maine and New Hampshire have raised the value of land on the Potomac from four dollars to forty or fifty, the price it fetched before the Revolution, rather induces a reflection on the superior prosperity of the times preceding, than those succeeding that event. The same sort of scepticism may be felt respecting the indignant denial by modern philo-Virginians, of the disappearance of 'the class of Virginian gentlemen of chivalrous honour, and polished manners, at once high-minded, delicate, liberal, and munificent,' and the rejection of the proposition that, 'as to mental cultivation, our best educated men of the present day cannot compare with the Lees, the Randolphs, the Jeffersons, Pendletons, and Wythes of that period.'

That single State furnished the Union with four out of the first five Presidents, and a large proportion of the most eminent diplomatists and ministers, men who have in all parts of the European Commonwealth, as well as at home, stamped their character and theories of government on the policy and constitution of America. Certainly it may be doubted whether, at all events, the Virginian State-Assembly have, since the Revolution was a *fait accompli*, ever possessed so large a number as then of eminent orators and statesmen. There, when Patrick Henry first appeared in it, an uncouth country lawyer, with a

stolid abstracted air, and in his coarse hunting dress, startling the propriety of the glittering lobbies and committee-rooms of the Legislature, were to be seen Speaker Robinson, a very Sir John Trevor in powers of management and want of integrity, and Peyton Randolph, a noted intriguer, though Attorney-General, solid rather than eloquent, and well versed in parliamentary practice, two of those business men, heirs to an historic name, who can direct discreetly all men's affairs but their own. Another example of the non-rhetorical debater, and therefore a proof of the existence in the House of Burgesses of a set of men, not caught by fine declamation, but who took the trouble to consider a statesman's business powers, was Richard Bland, the *Virginian antiquary*, as he was called, learned and logical, but apt to retreat, startled, from the conclusions to which his own arguments had led his hearers. Edward Pendleton, the Conservative lawyer, with silver voice, and almost equal in skill in managing the House to his friend Robinson, and George Wythe, afterwards Chief Justice, the law tutor of Jefferson, a first-rate classic, but with an excessive love, it is said, for the Elizabethan writers (where shall we find such a failing in Congress?), and an amount of eccentricity which could scarcely be believed to be the possible possession of one man, were all banded together, originally on the Liberal-Conservative side. With them was Richard Henry Lee, one of the few members who, no lawyers, were perfectly masters of all the practice and forms; a Cicero in debate, 'and,' we are informed by an admirer of his, 'with a Cæsarean nose,' and a man who, though 'no Niagara, Homer, or Patrick Henry, flowed through banks 'covered with the bloom of spring.' We confess that it appears to us more than doubtful whether, though Virginia has probably recently developed the Niagara vein of eloquence which Mr. Wirt admires, it have produced so distinguished a set of men as these old Whig Oppositionists of the generation anterior to the Revolution. They manifested a peculiarly English tone of dexterous parliamentary tactics. They were men who might be ruining themselves, but who nevertheless had learnt thoroughly how to manage the details of business, and who did not talk for talking's sake. They were sure of their position. They had no particular reverence for public opinion, and there was nothing which they hoped to get from popularity. Their object was to maintain a reputation for good business abilities among their fellow-magistrates and lords-lieutenant. A future age, in the effervescence of a Revolutionary crisis, threw up tyrants of debate like Patrick Henry, men who, their panegyrists allow, when entrusted, by acclamation, with the task of drawing up a simple resolution, faltered, and at length elaborated

a thing which was at once, with as universal a consent, consigned to oblivion. They were the Addisons of oratory, superseded by an under-clerk. The old Virginian statesmen seldom spoke on matters of grave public interest for longer than ten minutes at a time. They did not argue for victory, but simply to expound the opinion which they knew the rest would follow.

The Virginian politicians of the period of the Revolution in effect divide themselves under three great heads: the Conservatives, including few besides the Liberal-Conservatives (for the Tories were few at a period when the words *British Tory*, we are told, 'threw any company into a rage, and suggested tar and feathers'), the theoretical Democrats, men not from the people, and as sensitive of their personal rank as the aristocracy, from which, not wealth, but prejudices excluded them, but desirous to lead the people; and lastly, the real popular champions, such as Patrick Henry, men actually of, because from the masses, though from masses which themselves, in relation to a yet inferior body, constituted a highly privileged class. Of course, in the tide-water region, and more especially on the tropical banks of the James, thorough aristocrats might be found, of families which had never broken off their connexion with the English stock, men who often had been educated at Oxford or Cambridge, or fought a campaign in Flanders. They never, from first to last, pretended to popularity, and in many cases the heir had been sent to Europe on the first signs of the rising, and had there remained till the conclusion of peace. But the more influential of the party had always been Liberals as regarded the relations between the colony and mother-country, and Conservative only in respect to social relations and domestic policy. Of these, Washington, living towards the verge of the district, and with the more energetic and innovating Maryland stretching out in the distance, is a favourable, perhaps too favourable an example. He is their beau ideal, their apology, and in some measure the reflection of what this class once was. He is acknowledged by political adversaries to have possessed a judgment unsurpassed in soundness, better adapted to decide on the plans of others than to originate; to have been of an exact integrity and justice, and though naturally of an irritable temper, and a slave-owner, self-constrained and forbearing. He was liberal, but exact in his expenditure; not a fluent orator, and with little learning but reading, writing, arithmetic, and surveying, though he advocated all schemes for the promotion of education, and confessed to a great respect for Latin, and something of a mysterious reverence for Greek. He could dance, while a Republican commander-in-chief, three hours at

a time, and, when a Dictator, envy those whose rank did not scare partners. He, moreover, enjoyed the more serious reputation of being the best horseman of his time; and, though allied to English nobility, was the most practical of farmers, and a merchant, whose brand, 'George Washington, of Mt. Vernon,' passed a flour-barrel through the most suspicious West Indian custom-house.

Mount Vernon is in the district of the Potomac, now closed by the magnificent *façades* and marble terraces and balconies of Washington, before the river becomes the rocky romantic stream which it appears at its picturesque junction with the Shenandoah, at Harper's Ferry. This region, with its bold cliffs and wooded ridges, the waters beneath sparkling with countless shoals of herrings, carp, sturgeon, and bass, in their seasons, and darkened with armies of the canvas-back duck, was, in his time, the very heart of Virginian civilization. Now and then, a frigate would sail up from the broad Chesapeake, and, anchoring opposite the verandahs of a wealthy planter's mansion, pour forth a troop of officers and letters of introduction, to greet the squire who had, in many cases, as Lawrence Washington, himself served in the English navy. The river acted as a noble highway for gay barges to carry the planters and their wives to each other's houses, or to the festive little court of the Governor of Maryland, at Annapolis, with its balls, and dinners, and private theatricals. The shore line was studded with primitive but well-to-do farmhouses, such as the great General's birthplace, on Bridge's Creek, with its steep roof sloping into low projecting eaves, its single story, with the attic over, and great chimney at either end. It showed, too, and still does, many aristocratic edifices on the slopes above the water. Arlington, the house of Mr. Custis, Washington's step-grandson, with marble columns and porticoes, recalls the old days along with the new. Of a style of architecture not so classical, were Mount Vernon and hospitable Belvoir, built on the same ridge, the latter the residence of William Fairfax, Lawrence Washington's father-in-law, and just enough miles distant to provoke a ride and *réveillé* on a bright autumn morning. Many, we know, especially after the arrival of Lord Fairfax, were the hunting parties which met on the lawn of one or the other, to beat the wild woods, indented with rocks and rivulets, and natural deep dells, loved by fox and deer, to return to a hilarious hunting dinner, at which Washington seems to have had a capacity for being as merry as the most pleasure-loving of Diggeses or Randolphs. How proud he was of his stud, his truthful diary shows, where we read, set forth with something of gentle boastfulness, the

genealogies of 'Ajax,' and 'Magnolia,' and of keen fox-hounds, 'Music,' and 'Sweet-lips' and 'Ringwood,' and a host of others, calling up pleasant reminiscences blended of 'Midsummer Night's Dream' and 'Dandie Dinmont.' Mrs. Washington, the blooming widow of the *Honourable* John Parke Custis, whom readers of Mr. Thackeray will remember, a lady, however, of birth and connexions not to be despised even by Madam Esmonds, and who had brought her second husband 100,000 dollars, had, on her part, her carriage and four, with black postilions in scarlet and white liveries, as brilliant as a high sheriff's suite, wherein to proceed in solemn state to the church of Porchich, or of Alexandria, of both of which the General was a vestryman, or, it might be, to one of those simple subscription balls at the latter town, which he, in his bachelor days, fastidiously and minutely describes as 'the bread-and-butter ball,' where 'the tea and coffee had a deep resemblance 'to hot water, and pocket-handkerchiefs were made, without 'apology, to serve the purpose of table-cloths.' He himself was not ashamed to deck himself in fine clothes, as when he travelled forth, to the admiration, doubtless, of the simple north-eastern cities, on a splendid horse, with mounted negroes behind him, to meet Governor Shirley, unpacking, probably, for the purpose, the 'fashionable gold-laced hat,' the 'drab-coloured riding frock with plain double-gilt buttons,' the 'superfine scarlet cloth waistcoat,' 'livery suits to be chosen by his 'London tailor by the Washington arms and housings, with the 'Washington crest,' and 'the very neat and fashionable New-market saddle-cloth,' of all which his account-books make particular mention.

His kitchen was thronged with servants, and his cellar well stocked with old wine. Beautiful gardens surrounded the house, this being an improvement peculiarly his own on the comfortless carelessness of tide-water proprietors about anything in the way of plants but tobacco, or ornamental copses but poplar-trees. He was ever trying to naturalize beautiful foreign trees; and profound were his meditations as to the superiority of one in point of shade to another. In his diary we find noted, under January 16th, that the whitethorn was in berry; on the 20th, he is busy clearing the pine-groves of the underwood, and, in February and March, transplanting ivy to adorn his garden-walls, and evergreens to make a cheerful winter prospect, or opening vistas through his woods, and twining scarlet honeysuckle round the columns of his verandah. We discover even sentiment in his improvements. He is careful to plant horse-chesnuts from his native county of Westmoreland (U.S.), sent him by his favourite, Harry Lee, the son of the 'Lowland

beauty,' a 'chaste and troublesome passion' for whom he had been, he tells us, forced (before the mature age of sixteen) 'to bury in the grave of oblivion.'

But, with all this love of finery and pretty shrubberies, he, and many others, though always a minority of the tide-water proprietors, was a plain, honest, country gentleman, pruning his own plantations, and, as his own game and water preserver (for a Virginian landowner no more tolerated a poacher than any English one), chastising, spite of bludgeons and guns, trespassers on his rights over canvas-back ducks and oyster-beds. He kept his own books, and, week by week, even with the cares, never neglected, of a struggling nation upon him, communicated to his agent, by means of carefully drawn maps, his views on the culture of each special field, mixing with economy benevolent orders to him, after the Sir Roger de Coverley school of country squires, to keep up hospitality in his master's place, and to 'let no one go hungry away.' He was indeed a most thorough practical farmer, not very skilful, he says of himself, but an enthusiast, not only procuring ornamental balsam-trees from New York, and vines from Languedoc, but ploughs from no less an agriculturist than Arthur Young, showing too his zeal by inventing one himself, and nearly ruining two of his best carriage-horses by putting them to drag it over the heavy sward. He rose before dawn, lit his own fire, though a slave-owner, and one whose every look was studied, out of love, and not of fear, by his troops of servants, and rode for four or five hours over his estate. The whole was most systematically divided by him into four different farms, each having its own allotment of labourers, and particular crops, and, with its woodlands, pastures, cornlands, eleven miles of fisheries, and villages stocked with tailors, shoemakers, smiths, and ware-housemen, constituting a fertile self-supporting principality of from three to four thousand acres. The result was, that he made agriculture pay, unlike most of his neighbours, whose estates were first eaten up by encumbrances, and, at length, after the new Constitution set them free from entails, sold to the overseers at the rate of about four dollars an acre, the master emigrating, with a portion of his slaves, far beyond the Blue Mountains. Washington's estate is now, sad to say, itself in the same, or nearly the same condition, the shrubberies overgrown, the lawn obliterated, and the whole, in short, in process of relapsing into a haunt for bears and wolves.

The Blue Ridge was then, as now, the land of hope, or, it might be, the forlorn hope of the broken-down landowners of the James or Potomac. A hundred miles away, amid the noxious exhalations of the marshy tide-water region, and over its black

foliage, those azure peaks can be seen floating in air. In early Virginian history we hear of powerful Indian emperors, of barbarous chieftains, whom the English colonist loved to terrify himself by styling kings, Powhatans and Oppecancanoughs, whose sway was supreme throughout the hill-country. Round the base was a belt of land more fertile than the lowlands; but the native force was long too formidable, let alone the prejudice the planter had for placing his abode on an inlet of the sea, by which he could communicate directly with the mother-country, and the almost absolute necessity of such a position, before the making of good roads, for the disposal and carriage of his crops. By Charles a great grant of land in this direction was made to the Earl of St. Albans, Lord Berkeley, Sir William Martin and others, as proprietaries. Under their auspices, or in spite of them, the district gradually began to be settled, though the boundary of Virginia, till 1744, was still considered to be virtually that mountain range. A new grant was subsequently made, overriding the old one, of the royal right over the land between the Potomac and Rappahanock, called the Northern Neck, to Lord Culpepper, who had, says Oldmixon, 'trumped up a title to it,' and with very indefinite powers. It was in vain that the adventurers who had already occupied portions appealed to Charles (for Culpepper had shrewdly managed to get appeals in such cases transferred to the Crown from the Assembly, which had formerly cognisance of them). The answer was the obvious one, that, if they had encroached without a licence, they had done so at their own risk. They were forced eventually to compound with him for the payment of a quit-rent; Colonel Richard Lee, and Colonel Robert Carter, two of the chief Virginian magnates, members of the Council, and great freeholders on the Neck, consenting to act as his agents.

Thus the lands at the foot of the Blue Ridge became by degrees peopled, but, up to 1748, only a few Irish had made their way into the valley between it and North Mountain. Their 'repulsive manners,' we are told, over and above the bugbear of Indian forays, still interposed a barrier to any emigration thither from the alluvial country. But early in the reign of George II., Lord Fairfax was jilted for a duke by the belle of the day. Culpepper, whose favourite employment during his governorship seems to have been buying up light pieces of eight at five shillings, and then, by proclamation, raising their value to six, left no son to inherit this ill-gotten wealth. Fairfax was his grandson and heir through his mother; and, in his rage, this fashionable cornet in the Blues, who had studied Horace at Oxford, and written a paper in the 'Spectator' (which Sparkes, with patriotic exaggeration, multiplies into *papers*), made his

succession to a Virginian proprietorship a pretext for quitting England. His cousin, the Honourable William Fairfax, a brave soldier, formerly Governor of New Providence, which he had helped to reduce, and Chief Justice of the Bahamas, had long resided on the Northern Neck as his agent. The peer was delighted with the taste for country sports he found existing on the Chesapeake. He went back, but only to get the old grant to his ancestor explained, so as to take in a great tract beyond the Alleghanies, and then returned for good to plant grounds, and teach the people fox-hunting.

This immense tract of rich waste land had never been surveyed; and Lord Fairfax found that numerous squatters were making their way up the stream, and securing an occupancy in the best plots without licence from him, or any thought of paying quit-rents, such things having been ever most abhorrent to an American's instincts. Washington, who was perpetually about Belvoir, had become an especial favourite of his, having developed a remarkable capacity for comprehending his lessons on sporting matters, though he himself disclaims the fame of an accomplished fox-hunter. He obtained a commission from him to survey the region, at a rate of salary which enabled him to earn a doubloon, or as much as six pistoles, a day. This district, between the Blue Ridge and the Alleghanies, is the third of the four zones into which geographers and politicians agree in dividing Virginia. It possesses the most temperate climate, and the most fertile soil. The hills, rarely rising to more than 2,000 feet, and presenting 'one continuous waving line, with intervening glens like gigantic wrinkles and furrows,' are covered so thickly with beech, cedars, and oak, red, white, and black, hung with roses and wild vines green in the midst of March, that surveyors are even now obliged to climb to the top of a tree to examine the country. The turf beneath is a complete garden. Rhododendrons, azaleas, the shumac, and *Kalmia* fringe the various-coloured cliffs which crop up beside the pathway; and, over all, are the blue summits melting away in the distance. The defect of the range is, that the ridge is not sufficiently broken; and there is a want of individuality about the several mountains. But it compensates for this deficiency in picturesqueness by its universal fertility. Even on the higher slopes are now found farms, chiefly on the Pennsylvanian frontier, cultivated by Germans, who have brought with them the experience, though, travellers say, scarcely the cleanliness, of civilization.

Beyond this beautiful Alpine region, Washington entered, in company with young George Fairfax, surveying, as he went along, a grand valley twenty-five miles broad, bounded by the Blue Mountains, with 'their soft liquid tints of mingled blue

and green,' on the one side, and North Mountain, a division of the Alleghanies, on the other; and irrigated throughout by the Shenandoah, 'daughter of the stars,' as the Indian tribes called it for its beauty. This great central valley of Virginia is now the chief pride of the State. It is often called 'Virginia' simply. It is a great wheat and Indian corn growing country; and the slopes of every hill are painted with sunny-looking peaches and apples. Its social aspects are said to be intermediate between those of the birthplace of 'sweet-scented' tobacco, which had even then shifted to the east of the mountains, and of the maize and cotton plantations of the lower tide-water country, on the one hand, and those of the Northern States on the other. The number of slaves is smaller than in the former, and labour, which is also much more agreeable there to the physical constitution of the white man, does not involve a loss of caste. The estates, too, are generally for the same reason more moderate in extent. The tone of comfort is greater; and farmers do not, as farther south, live from year to year on pork, salt fish, or corn bread; but make the soil yield fruit and garden vegetables. Many are to be found of the class described by Jefferson—'I know no condition happier than that of a Virginian farmer might be. His estate supplies a good table, clothes himself and his family with their ordinary apparel, furnishes a small surplus to buy salt, sugar, coffee, and a little finery for his wife and daughters, enables him to receive and visit his friends, and furnishes him with a pleasing and healthy occupation.' Nevertheless, there are also many estates in this delicious valley on a far ampler scale, large enough to afford their owners leisure for studying politics and refinement, and to provide a surplus for the exercise of the munificent hospitality which delights a southern planter. Some domains, as probably the lands of the house of Fairfax, are even princely.

The country now, with its baths, and springs of sulphur, salt, red, and white, first made fashionable by Washington himself, who purchased the site of one of the principal, crowded as Saratoga, and expensive as Pau or Biarritz, would amaze Solomon Hedge, Esquire, his Majesty's Justice of the Peace, to whose supper party the young explorer, and the rest of the company, brought their own knives, and did without forks. The latter was in ecstasies with the valley, its beauty and its richness, its oaks, and sugar-maples; and Lord Fairfax was so fired by his report, that within a short time he moved from his cousin's house at Belvoir, across the Blue Ridge, with horses and dogs, books, retainers, and coats of arms. He laid out a noble manor of ten thousand acres, with pastures, woodland, and cornland, to be entitled, with the stately manor-house he

designed to build upon it, Greenway Court. For the present, he took up his residence in his steward's 'quarter,' a long stone house on a green knoll overlooking the Shenandoah, one story high, with dormer windows, and two wooden belfries, a roof with low eaves, and a long verandah the whole length of the house for summer evening sauntering. About the knoll were outhouses for servants, stables, and kennels, and a hut twelve feet square, in which it pleased the master, from some pet eccentricity, to sleep, away from the main building. In the library, Washington, a constant guest, loved to read English history, and the 'Spectator,' often, we may be sure, talking to the old lord of his particular contribution thereto.

The gaunt old man, with his near sight, light grey eyes, and sharp features, and generally strange appearance and manifold oddities, soon won the hearts of his neighbours. He acted, with the greatest ardour, the part of road-surveyor, and, in the character of lord-lieutenant of the county, was in the habit of feasting, during the assizes at Cumberland, all the notables of the vicinity. At one time he would be drilling a militia cavalry troop on his lawn; at another, when game was scarce at Greenway Court and Belvoir, he migrated *en masse* to some rustic inn, in the heart of a wild forest, and there made all who could join his hunting party his guests for weeks at a time. When the Indian tribes were in arms all about him, at the time of Braddock's fatal expedition, he disdained to remove to the lower country, and, with his negroes and half-breed huntsmen and friends, beat the woods as before. The Revolution was a heavy grief to him. No one ever dreamt of molesting the old man, though he did not care to disguise his royalism; but the surrender of Cornwallis at Yorktown to his old friend and *protégé*, is said to have killed him, if it is necessary to look for any special reason for the death of a man of ninety-two. Thus pathetically does a local poet sing that catastrophe, after a prose prelude how that he called to his valet, 'Come, Joe, carry me to bed; for it is high time for me to die.'

'Then up rose Joe, all at the word,
And took his master's arm.
And thus to bed he slowly led
The lord of Greenway Farm.

'Then oft he called on Britain's name,
And oft he wept full sore,
Then sighed, "Thy will, O Lord, be done,"
And word spake never more.'

WHEM'S *History of Mount Vernon.*

'To this new country, opened up by Washington, and emancipated, by the residence in it of so great a glory to Virginia

as an English baron, from the ill name, which, as we have mentioned, the infesting of it by Irish may have given it, soon thronged crowds of adventurers. Thither came, in 1772, Horatio Gates, godson and reputed son of Horace Walpole, once well known in fashionable London coteries, and who had long before achieved in America a brilliant military fame. He was now, at the age of forty-six, a disappointed half-pay officer, somewhat corpulent and *passé*, and, we are told, 'with a disagreeable proneness to wheedle,' got by haunting antechambers and Pall Mall. He bought an estate beyond the Blue Ridge, in Berkeley County, called the 'Traveller's Rest,' a name suggesting a pre-existence in the shape of a roadside inn; and then he looked round to see how he could best turn the circumstances of this troubled period to account. About the same time, his friend Lee, major-general to the King of Poland, and aide-de-camp to his Majesty of Portugal, besides holding various other honorary offices, was, among other birds of prey, who seem to have scented the war from afar, wandering about America. His journey ostensibly was undertaken to make good some claim he had upon Government to a grant in the South; but he had already been strongly suspected of tampering with the New England patriots. Gates wrote eagerly to him, expatiating on the advantages of a neighbouring farm, then for sale, with a flour-mill, and 2,400 acres, sure in ten years, he affirmed, to have doubled their value. In the meantime, he offers him 'a good bed, and two or three slaves, at the "Traveller's Rest," 'to wait on his whimsies' (one of these whimsies, and one, too, peculiarly disagreeable to neat Mrs. Washington, we learn, being a habit of taking troops of dogs about with him to friends' houses, and even insisting on having them accommodated with seats at the dinner-table). We suppose, from Gates's own allusions, that his farmhouse was moderately comfortable; but General Lee's, on the Shenandoah, was a mere shell, the different (proposed) apartments being indicated only by lines chalked on the ground. It was at least, he would argue, economical; he could, from any part, without the least inconvenience, overlook the entire establishment, enjoying the luxuries of library, bed-room, harness-room, and kitchen, without stirring a foot. It was to this primitive abode that this tattered soldier of fortune, suspected, neglected, and virulent, retired about the middle of the war, to abuse his 'Small Friends,' and, with a sneer at Washington, declare his belief that 'hoeing tobacco must be the best school to form a consummate general.'

Washington himself, although he had done so much, in youth and age, to make the region known, and had even sagaciously bought some very fertile portions of it, cannot be considered a

representative of its planters. He is the ideal of what the old tide-water planter might have been, with the fine equipages, and manners, and prerogative of a feudal lord of a manor, but the spirit and industry of a merchant of Amsterdam. Other proprietors in the 'great valley,' *grands seigneurs* as Lord Fairfax, and sojourners as Lee and Gates, were never American in their habits of thought and feeling. President Jefferson, though not locally belonging actually to the Shenandoah, is a good representative of the intermediate state of society which flourishes on its banks. He had large possessions, both at Poplar Forest, in Bedford County, and at Monticello, close to the town of Charlottesville. Some of the wonders of the district were close to his own lands; the natural bridge was even his property. He always considered himself a natural enemy of the tide-water aristocracy. Washington, in common with the latter class, doubted the future of a republic; but Jefferson believed in it most implicitly, and was a democrat as to social, as well as a republican as to foreign relations. By fortune he belonged to the higher ranks, having, in the rich hollows of the Blue Ridge Highlands, an estate of from five to six thousand acres, and at Poplar Forest a great tobacco-plantation, with flour-mills, canals, and locks, leading from the Rivanna, constructed at a cost of thirty thousand dollars. He was, too, a great slave-owner, possessing about a couple of hundred, though in his 'Notes on Virginia' he denounces the system, and sublimely exclaims, 'The only firm basis of national liberty is the conviction that liberty is the gift of God.'

So far as theory went, Jefferson was consistent enough. But his assertion of the right of all to equal privileges, and outcry against presidential titles, and levées, and tables of precedence, were combined with the prejudices and habits of a Virginian gentleman. He was especially jealous of any assumption of a right to intrude upon his privacy, upon the ground of his public character, or to criticise his private conduct. The visitor who introduced himself with the remark that 'he had availed himself of a common privilege of calling upon him,' was met with a far more chilling rebuff than Scott's American persecutors at Abbotsford. In the same tone he complains to his brother-ex-president Adams of the multitude of letters with which his leisure was fretted and worried. 'Is this life? It is the life of a mill-stone. To such a life that of a cabbage would be paradise.' Neither was his general mode of life in the least democratic, in the ordinary sense of the term. The care of his Poplar Forest estate he left wholly to an overseer, a course fatal, he himself acknowledges, to the profits of a southern plantation. He declares, indeed, that 'from breakfast to dinner, he was always in his

'shops, his garden, or on horseback among his farms;' and that 'he talked with his neighbours of ploughs and harrows, seeding and harvesting,' affecting, moreover, great interest, while abroad, in the probable returns from his 'little essay in red clover;' but it seems exceedingly probable that a nursery of young politicians he kept down in the neighbouring village of Charlottesville, directing their studies, and conversing frequently with them on subjects of politics, was the object of many of these rides. Or perhaps he was composing Greek epitaphs, or criticizing Plato, whom, we are shocked to find, he had the want of taste to decry as 'full of puerilities and unintelligible jargon.' He had a fondness, too, for fine horses, spending, for instance, at one time, a couple of thousand dollars on the purchase of four, and a polite taste for French cookery, to the indignation of Patrick Henry, who called it 'treason against one's native victuals.' Every stranger who brought to Monticello letters of introduction, was invited to stay. He was never without occasional guests, entertaining his neighbours from Marrowbone, Horse Pasture, and Poison Field, and other localities which his letters have made classical, and all, of whatever phase of politics, with the same courtesy. Even those federal Tories of Bedford County, who, he knew, detested his doctrines, as he did theirs, were there; and musical prisoners of war from Burgoyne's staff, for whose stay in Albemarle he pleaded successfully with the Legislature, on the ground of their having planted gardens, and collected for themselves poultry, were no less heartily welcomed than their predecessor at Collé, the Italian Mazzei, whose vineyards they treated as ruthlessly as did Czar Peter Evelyn's holly hedge at Say's Court. An incessant flood of visitors was contributed from the neighbouring University of Virginia, built among the woods on the same skirts of the Blue Ridge as Monticello, under his immediate supervision, after a quasi classical model, and with a course of studies from which were *not* excluded those Latin and Greek classics, which, in his first burst of zeal for experimental philosophy, he abuses, in the description of William and Mary's College, in his 'Notes,' as 'disgusting and degrading' to those magnificent 'young gentlemen already prepared for entering on the sciences.'

Besides his schemes for reforming education, he believed that he had a vocation for amending the architecture of his native State; and the four parallel ranges of this neighbouring university, with the glittering dome of its rotunda, are monuments of his views on the subject. His own house was a favourable instance of gentlemen's houses on the outskirts of the Blue Ridge. It commanded a glorious view to the east, over an undulating forest plain, with the mountains seen stretching away

to the distance of a hundred miles. Aboriginal forest-trees surrounded it on three sides, the fourth being occupied by a large hanging garden. Of course, the mansion had a Grecian portico and cupola, and raised terraces. Saloons, and hall, and drawing-rooms were crowded with curiosities, moose and elk, Indian weapons and Italian statuary, and the library well stored with books, and mathematical and philosophical instruments (indeed, on journeys, he was in the habit of taking with him, somewhat after the fashion of Dr. Johnson, a set of logarithm tables); while walls and floors were adorned with paintings, and mosaic work by his slaves.

Unhappily, in addition to various elegant tastes, this really great politician had all a southern planter's instinct of living beyond his income. Even his presidential salary of 25,000 dollars, *i. e.* about five thousand guineas, a year, did not prevent his quitting office, at the end of eight years, ten thousand dollars out of pocket. His estate gradually dwindled away. Bad crops were looked upon as mere accidents, which would not recur, and plots of land sold to defray the loss; while a good harvest was treated as a windfall, and not taxed to supply the defect of the previous autumn. His labourers, who should have been at the plough, were engaged meantime on works of art. The result of all this was, that the statesman who had, in and out of office, vehemently discouraged lotteries, was persuaded finally, in his necessity, to ask as a charity from the Assembly of the State the right to institute one, for the more profitable sale of his plantation. It is impossible to avoid being amused, this being the ex-president's own financial condition, at the argument which he uses to induce Short, Munroe, and Madison, the two latter subsequently presidents, to fix their residence near; urging their migration on the ground not merely of the opportunity of social intercourse, but of the example of economy they might show the whole country side. Albemarle County was not allowed to watch these economists in direct collocation. Only Munroe went so far as to build a house in the mountains; but he was soon called away to pursuits in which he made altogether, from first to last, 400,000 dollars, yet died insolvent; truly a proper person to be advised by Jefferson to solicit his friends for an office of from 800 to 1,000 dollars' salary! Nevertheless, there was a clear difference between the extravagance of these statesmen of the Blue Ridge, and that of the tide-water proprietors. Both classes had an equal tendency to insolvency; but in the extravagance of the latter there was a method, which made their difficulties a greater reproach to themselves. Deliberately they lived beyond their incomes for the love of state and show, or from absolute indolence and recklessness. The former class,

such as Jefferson and Munroe, found their resources gradually wasting away, they did not know how. They had forgotten, in their own cases, though they were always reminding others and each other of the secret, that a Virginian planter must, to keep solvent, ever think of himself as a merchant and farmer; not as an English landlord, whose only care is to collect his rents. Their excuse, though not a perfectly satisfactory one, was that, had they preserved their fortunes, they could not, probably, have devoted themselves, as they did, to the business of the State.

Virginia, besides its rich proprietors, whether tide-water oligarchs, Shenandoah farmers, or theorists and statesmen, in the villas of the Blue Ridge, had, and still has, its class of yeomen, composed indiscriminately of the old colonists, more recent emigrants, and emancipated bondsmen. According to the constitution of the settlement, it was intended that the chief part of the land should belong to this order of men, it being contemplated by the original scheme, as in that of New England, that only a few men of distinguished rank or wealth, and likely to give a tone to the province, or if necessary to defend its rights at home, were to be allured into residing, by grants of large domains. But this original plan had been subverted by the avarice of governors and surveyors-general, who gave to any single individual, who had sufficient wealth or influence over them, many lots of fifty acres, or by the fraud, connived at by the officials, of ship captains, who obtained in different counties different independent allotments, in virtue of the same voyage. Such yeomen as there were, with, it is true, an inferior degree of energy, resulting from the difference of climate, do not seem to have been in kind different from the farmers of the north-east. They made no pretence to grandeur. They did not ride the magnificent horses found by Cornwallis in Virginian stables, and which La Fayette styles 'racers.' Their steeds were like dogs, and they dwelt in log huts. The oppression of the upper classes, who lent them goods and money at enormous interest, gradually, however, spoilt their better qualities, and they certainly do not form a very prepossessing feature in the general history of Virginia, with their high temper and slovenly lazy ways, indulging in the fashionable pursuits of hunting and racing, and mortgaging, along with their rich neighbours. However, to this class belonged Patrick Henry, and he was not ashamed of it, though his biographer, Mr. Wirt, describes him grandly, as born at the family seat of Audley, and son of no less a personage than Colonel Henry, who also occasionally acted as a county magistrate. With them he certainly ate, drank, and talked, dressing in their rough costume, and even, when now famous, using much of their accent.

At one time, he managed a store. When this failed, with more of the spirit supposed to mark a Yankee than a Virginian, he betook himself to practising in the county courts, in one of which his own father presided, though occasionally officiating as his father-in-law, Skelton's, substitute, at a bar of a different kind, kept at Hanover Court-house. Hunting and dancing still occupied much of his attention; and his first meeting with a future coadjutor, Jefferson, was at a ball given by Colonel Dandridge, while on ordinary occasions he would rush in to conduct a case, fresh from the chase, in a slouched hat and tattered clothes. A New Englander of the middle class is consistent in his ways; he dresses for his common business in good broadcloth, he does not change it for extraordinary occasions. Patrick Henry is a type of a far less regular and orderly set of men. At the bar of the general court we find him arranged in a full suit of black velvet, and an elaborately powdered tie wig. On his election into the House of Burgesses, he had advanced to a peach-coloured coat, after the fashion of Goldsmith; and on taking his place as governor of his native State, and migrating with his household into a palace (thus the governor's mansion was styled), he blazed forth in a trailing scarlet robe, and other Roman-senator-like magnificences; all which furnished copious matter for sneers to the young gentlemen fresh from European courts, who were wont to profess that they could not think it of great importance, 'whether a country were ruled by a despot with a tiara on his head, or by a demagogue with a red cloak and caul-bare wig.'

The great merit of him and his class was their fulness of life and energy. The Randolphs and Robinsons, when they laid down an office, retired to the superior dignity and influence of country gentlemen, surrounded by troops of admiring friends and dependents. Henry, on the contrary, and his class had, on retiring, to resume their practice or other business. He, for instance, betook himself to the drudgery of the petty district courts of Prince Edward County and New London. But these men, at all events, succeeded in effecting what was altogether beyond the reach of the great old families, viz. the realization of fortunes. It was only after a double manhood of labour, as it were, that he retired to live out an honoured old age, and the evenings of many summers, under the shade of a huge walnut-tree in which he most delighted.

He ever acknowledged himself, and was acknowledged by his old equals, to be from and of them, and their representative throughout. It can hardly be but that they possess a capacity for the qualities which he developed so fully. Now, the Virginian Capes are no longer a by-word in Bristol, Liverpool,

and the London Exchange. Trade, and wealth, and political power have drifted round the Alleghanies, north-east and south-west, and its marine is exceeded by that of so small a State as Maine. The Old Dominion, which once esteemed the Presidentship all but its inalienable right, has gradually sunk below Ohio, and holds but the fourth place in the representation in Congress. Even its progress, where any, is due to strangers, not to its own people. Farmers from Maine locate themselves on the rich shores of the Potomac, and gather in abundant harvests from land which overseers had reported to be thoroughly exhausted; and companies from England, Old and New, are working mines, the very existence of which was unknown to the native Virginians, and giving the latter hire for doing what they would have never consented to undertake on their own account. All this Virginia has richly deserved. Few countries have enjoyed greater advantages, or had a fairer start into prosperity, or more misused them all. Its hope of rising again, if the blight of slavery can be removed, must be found, not in the old lineage still vegetating on the river estuaries, or in the accident of a party of clever, dexterous statesmen, choosing for their retreat the Shenandoah, or belt at the foot of the Blue Ridge, but in the old race of yeomen who still do exist, in whatever part of the State, and of whatever origin,—whether descended from fellow-voyagers of Sir Walter Raleigh, or from convicts sold for a few pounds of coarse tobacco.

- ART. III.—1. *London Union on Church Matters. Annual Report, 1858.*
 2. *Society for the Revival of Convocation. Annual Report, 1858.*
 3. *Ecclesiological Society. Annual Report, 1859.*

WE remember having been greatly struck by an observation which we read, many years since, in some article or pamphlet, in which the writer says, that if he were asked what he believed would be the future of the Church movement, he would reply, that in his opinion it would, as years went on, make less apparent, but more real, progress. We fear that this author was among those who at an early date struck their flag to the Vatican. But the value of all prophecy is independent of the personal life of the prophet; and in this instance circumstances have singularly concurred to confirm the prediction.

Now that we have arrived at the commencement of a fresh decade, we may reasonably use the experience of 1860 to look back upon the fortunes of a movement which commenced twenty-seven years since, if dated from the first publication of the 'Tracts for the Times,' and thirty-three if we refer the Church revival to the appearance of the 'Christian Year.' This movement, or revival, has in the meanwhile passed through several phases and numberless vicissitudes. It has oftentimes been utterly extinguished, if we are to believe the assurances of the newspapers any year for the last quarter of a century; and time after time, during the same period, the fathers, brothers, and husbands of England have been spasmodically exhorted to resist the heresy whose insidious progress threatened to invade the sanctity of every hearth. What is of more consequence, the souls of those to whom the revival of Apostolic Christianity and of the Church of the English Prayer-Book was the most sacred and the most strong incentive to active exertion, must have frequently bounded with joy at some great and unexpected success, or sunk at some sad and apparently undeserved blow. But still the movement has gone on. It has not leavened the whole English Church, neither has it fallen from within or without. The whole force, material, moral, and intellectual, of the opposite interest—the Low Church, or so-called Evangelical party—has been arrayed against it, and it has held its own. The political and sectarian foes of the Establishment have thought to make good their attacks by railing at the 'Tractarianism' existing within its limits, and yet the Establishment, Tractarian or not, still exists in honour

and pre-eminence. The Church of Rome now reckons among its most ardent votaries several of those who were early and forward in the English revival, and yet that revival confronts their present assault with the weapons which they themselves had helped to forge. What, however, will be the end of all this? Thirty years is a short time for a cause which is destined ultimately to triumph, to make good its footing upon the hard and slippery soil of public opinion. Thirty years, again, is not a long space for the temporary and fluctuating success of an agitation, to which its bitterest antagonists are compelled to attribute the worldly merits of ability and earnestness in its votaries, the poetry of tradition and ceremonialism, and the practical recommendations of a symmetrical and authoritative system. Is that Church movement, then, which is now energising in a second generation, at the beginning of its end, or at the end of its beginning? We have, for our own part, no hesitation in saying, that we believe the latter to be the case; but while we make the assertion, we desire as explicitly to say that we do not for a moment anticipate a run of unchequered success, as the normal condition of sound Churchmanship in that generation. We must, moreover, add that many of the difficulties with which its course has been hampered were of its own seeking, and have arisen from the defective policy of Churchmen themselves, not less than from the defections to Rome, or the unmitigated hostility of that Puritanism which exists both outside and within the Church of England. The *Church cause* (a term which we shall employ for the remainder of this article in preference to 'movement' or 'revival') is, we believe, both holding and gaining ground, although the Church school is stationary, and the Church 'party' for the present unfortunately absent on furlough. To explain our phraseology, we must observe that for the few earliest years of the movement the advocacy of Church principles rested in the hands of a school, in the academic sense of the term. During another term that school had grown into a party, and still more lately the party has retired into the background. In other terms, we have first to deal with a cause and a school, next with a cause and a party, and finally with a cause.

We shall not take up the history of the revival while it continued to be merely a cause and a school. The growth of genuine Church principles for the few first years after No. 1 of the Tracts for the Times had appeared was solid and extensive, although it encountered opposition not only from Puritan and Latitudinarian, but from that too often timid and unenergetic residuum of the ancient High Churchmanship which called itself the old orthodox party, and was designated by the 'new' school by the less

complimentary cognomen of 'high-and-dry.' During its 'school' days, the attention of Churchmen of the modern stamp was directed to doctrinal rather than to administrative quasi-political or ritualistic questions, although the movement had its rise in the political shocks which the Church received through the suppression of the ten Irish sees, and the threatened attacks on the Prayer-Book and on the English Establishment, by which the first reformed Parliament carried popularity.

The process by which the famous address of heads of families to William IV. in favour of the integrity of the Established Church grew in the hands of a few eminent Oxford men into a proclamation more bold than our generation are accustomed to hear, of the essential characteristics of a Church in its theological sense, was really short and simple. The immediate result was that as the perils of the Establishment seemed to diminish, the movement apparently collapsed, and continued for some time to have its centre in the common room and college library. The earliest occasion on which anything like a Church party under the influence of the Oxford school appeared on the scene was on the occasion of the first of the two public demonstrations against the successive preferments of one who, after having twice rallied the strength of orthodox Churchmanship against himself, has singularly subsided into a peaceable prelate, remarkable if for anything for a quiet but friendly encouragement of the Church cause in his diocese. Need we name Dr. Hampden? In the successful proceedings taken against him by the general body of Oxford graduates, on his appointment in 1836 to the Regius Chair of Divinity, were combined Churchmen of the new school, the old orthodox, and the zealous Evangelicals, Mr. Vaughan Thomas being joined with Mr. Newman and Dr. Pusey in the conduct of the case; and the significance of the event was probably not lost on the sensible minister to whom the Episcopal bench owed a Denison, a Longley, and a Thirlwall. We remember hearing not long after, when very young, an enthusiastic Oxford Churchman descanting on the probability of Mr. Newman being the next Lady Margaret Professor, owing to the sympathy between his then views and those of the majority of country clergymen, graduates in divinity, whom this event had brought up. These graduates came to Oxford and dispersed again, and the Church party was still in an inchoate state, although it had succeeded in the first great requisite for a party—the selection of its leaders. We need not say who the three 'illustrations' of Oxford were whom the universal voice of Churchman designated to that post. Another man, H. J. Rose, who had at an earlier date upraised the voice of Churchmanship at Cambridge, was too

soon lost to the world and to the Church. The creation about this time of the Metropolis Churches Fund evoked liberality for a specific religious end such as had too long been strange to our Church.

We pass over five years, and take our stand at the eventful epoch of Sir Robert Peel's second administration. The Church party had then grown into something like shape and consistency, and its numbers were constantly being recruited from the younger generation. It had succeeded in arresting the attention, often the respect, never the contempt, though not unfrequently the dislike, of the organs of public opinion. It wanted some things which a party ought to have possessed; there was no central organization for the interchange of thought and counsel, neither was there any newspaper advocating Church opinions, although it had a monthly organ in the *British Magazine* as originally conducted; and the *British Critic*, long the quarterly organ of the old High Churchmen, had at a later date passed into the hands of the new school, and was for some time edited by Mr. Newman himself. But the list of the well-known and trusted leaders at Oxford was still unbroken. Dr. Mill had returned to England, and had assumed a leading position at Cambridge, in which University, under the auspices of the Camden, now Ecclesiological, Society, that systematic development of the decencies of worship, and the charms of religious art, had been inaugurated, which has since extended so far and thriven so vigorously. Dr. Hook, at Leeds, exercised an enormous influence. Mr. Gladstone, who had already published his elaborate treatise on Church and State, was called into the new Government, though not at first into the Cabinet, and was justly regarded as the lay leader of the Church 'party,' a party which received several accessions of Parliamentary strength at the dissolution of 1841. With a 'Conservative' Government in, Churchmen seemed to breathe again, although Sir Robert Peel had been the author of the Ecclesiastical Commission during his previous administration. Still there were elements of danger lurking under this seeming prosperity. The error of judgment had been committed, of publishing, among Mr. R. H. Froude's Remains, crude and confidential fragments of the private letters and journals of a man, really too young, with all his ability, to be raised to the position of a theological teacher and leader, and the enemies of the Church cause had made the worst of the matter. But a more serious peril impended. Dr. Wiseman's two articles upon the Donatists had two years previously appeared in the *Dublin Review*; and though the fact was kept a long time concealed from the general public, his shaft had struck the noblest quarry, and had disturbed the

mind of that man whose brilliant abilities had long raised him to the unquestioned intellectual leadership of the revival, of which he was one of the earliest promoters, as well as the foremost antagonist of the Church of Rome.

Hoc fonte derivata clades. Of all the theological chiefs of the Church cause, Mr. Newman was emphatically the *ἀνὴρ πολιτικός*—he was the one teacher endowed with the instinct of putting secular powers in motion in connexion with scholastic guiding. Without this instinct the deepest learning, the simplest and most guileless life are deficient in the qualities peculiarly essential to the conduct of a party. It is accordingly almost impossible to express how detrimental to the cause was the misfortune of a leader, so specially endowed, being, as it were, stricken in mid course, while in the enjoyment of the confidence of a party powerful and energetic, but in a great degree young, enthusiastic, and unversed in the ways of the world. An attitude more trying for the person himself we cannot conceive, and we are accordingly most anxious to say nothing which should seem to impute moral blame to that great, though mistaken man, Mr. Newman. No evidence has transpired to show that his feelings at first were more than those of anxious and unsatisfied doubt. To have published such doubts, and to have retired from his position, would have been to have inflicted the gravest possible blow on the cause which he still might have been able to lead, with a heart and mind relieved from any misgivings. Still the difficulty on the other side was as great in deciding how far it was right even to profess to sound the trumpet, with the risk that the sound might be uncertain.¹ Without dissecting feelings more minutely, we may venture to say that from the day that his misgivings gained the mastery over his mind, Mr. Newman's practical usefulness as the leader of the 'new' Church party had come to an end. The effects of his disorganizing influence soon made themselves felt. The tone of the *British Critic*, able as ever, became suspiciously acrid. The gallant plunge which Mr. Oakeley had made in London, into a hearty, though somewhat uninstructed manifestation of Church worship, according to the rule of the Christian seasons and the spirit of the Prayer-Book, was gradually sicklied over with an unhealthy hue of clique. Matters, to be sure, had been previously brought to a head by Tract 90, and the war of pamphlets which it created; and Mr. Newman, under an episcopal censure, most considerately administered, retired, to settle down at Littlemore into what we fully believe he intended, at the time, should be a condition of meditation, if not of isolation,

¹ The text 'If the Trumpet,' &c. was the motto of the 'Tracts for the Times.'

but which, under the sharp provocation of the subsequent 'Jerusalem Bishopric' scheme, and owing to his restless energy, soon grew into a college within colleges, a school within a school, a party within a party, zealous, learned, and self-denying, to the extent of asceticism, but still alien from the general tone of the English Church, and following its own path, however divergent from the broad way of the Church cause.

The formidable and powerful opposition to the movement, which had heretofore sparred in the air, then found aim enough and to spare for the most scientific prize-fighting. The painful episode of Dr. Pusey's condemnation to a lengthened silence from preaching at Oxford, by the Six Doctors, in consequence of his sermon on the Eucharist, preached in May, 1843, occurred about this time. This event caused great excitement, and deep indignation was felt for the sufferer; but the period expired, and the learned and saintly orator returned to the University pulpit, steadfast, as before, in the Church of England. Mr. Macmullen's persecution, which occurred about the same time, also helped to keep up the spirits of Churchmen to indignation pitch.

We do not insist on the unfortunate stone-altar case. It was a great mistake not to have carried it to the Judicial Committee; but this discomfiture did not exercise any marked or general influence. The cause still thrived, and the party grew, although the voice of S. Mary's preacher was hushed. Clergyman after clergyman saw that there was something in it, and acted on the perception. Squire after squire began restoring or building his church in a fashion which would have made his father's hair stand on end. Gentle and simple, men and women, took to frequent communions, and to attending services, weekday and holyday, in a way which ten years sooner would have perplexed the most apathetic neighbourhood. The old Church societies saw their coffers overflowing as they had never done before; and the newer experiments, such as the Additional Curates' Society, gained a solid footing. Bishops charged upon the Church revival, some with considerable though variously accentuated favour, a few with a bitterness which showed how severely the unhealthy cuticle of Puritanism had been galled. Conspicuous by ready talents and influential position, Bishop Blomfield had delivered that charge in 1842, which almost placed him in the position of leading the Church party. To be sure, the results of the surplice row, which began at Exeter, and, spreading to a Berkshire parish, led to the *Times's* tergiversation, went far to neutralize the immediate effect of that *pronunciamento*, but yet it left its permanent mark behind. Besides, the Bishop himself abandoned his own counsels at the dictation of the Islington clergy, an event which of

course created a position more or less uncomfortable between him and those of his clergy who had complied with his injunctions, the effects of which were long felt, while those who had defied his authority were enabled to, and did make use of, the advantage which they had thus gained. But elsewhere the cause prospered; and above all things, the glorious and successful movement in favour of an extended colonial episcopate, which commenced on the election of Mr. Selwyn for New Zealand, which was followed up by the systematic organization of the Colonial Bishops' Fund, and was crowned by Miss Coutts' munificence, went far to prove the cause triumphant. Still the Church party did not manage its opportunities as well as it might have done. Mr. Newman's course had, as we have seen, deprived it of its politico-theological leader. Publicly it manifested a feeling of suspicion towards politicians, which savoured somewhat of the cloister. Undoubtedly Sir Robert Peel had no love for the 'new' school. It was not wonderful that a man, sensitive almost to morbidness, could not have cherished much affection for a movement, symbolized, in his eyes, by that 'Catholicus,' the pseudonym of the redoubtable Newman, to whom the *Times*, in its passing fit of uncompromising Churchmanship, had opened its columns for a series of letters, keenly turning to ridicule the statesman's elaborated discourse on his inauguration as Lord Rector of Glasgow. But for all that, Sir Robert Peel had even less love for Exeter Hall; and the minister whose bishops, presented or translated, were Lonsdale, Gilbert, Bagot, Wilberforce, and Turton, was one whom the Church party, instructed by subsequent events, would have treated more civilly than it cared to do during the days of his power, in spite of the Jerusalem blunder. The abortive Education Bill of Sir James Graham gave the Church privileges such as no minister has since ventured to offer; it was, however, rejected, but its rejection led to a public display of Churchmanship in the voluntary fund for Church education in the manufacturing districts, which deserves to be commemorated among the noticeable successes of the Church cause. 'Sir Robert Peel's Act,' for dividing and endowing parishes, was conceived in a spirit of justice to the Church; although it did not add a farthing to its revenues, and its results in multiplying pauper incumbencies, without the means, moral or material, of properly manning them, or serving the churches when manned, have proved very far from a decided advantage to the Church of England. To this epoch also belongs Archbishop Howley's Act, relieving, though incompletely, the disabilities of Scotch and American clergymen. Unfortunately the airy something, called 'Young England,'

the earliest, and the soonest abandoned, experiment of Mr. Disraeli, was confounded, in political estimation, with the Church cause, and tended not a little to damage it with practical persons. The foundation of the Queen's Colleges in Ireland, a clumsy attempt at liberal Latitudinarianism, in a soil ready prepared for a brilliant experiment in denominational university creation (an experiment which would have gone far to render the recent proceedings of the Roman Hierarchy impossible), did not mend matters with Churchmen. Sir Robert Peel's obstinate and narrow opposition to the retention of the Welsh bishoprics, at the price of the creation of the one new see of Manchester, created a sore, and the repeal of the Corn-laws most unluckily converted a large mass of the country clergy into acrimonious politicians. So fell, in 1846, the famous Peel Government, towards the establishment of which High Churchmen had rushed to the poll in 1841.

But outside of political conflicts, the Church party had been passing through more than one trying crisis. The wretched Jerusalem bishopric disheartened sound-minded men, and cut the last thread which kept Mr. Newman's mind in doubt. Mr. Ward's audacious, though able, and in many parts edifying, 'Ideal of a Christian Church,' which appeared in 1844, provoked, as might have been expected, fierce opposition, and that opposition took hold of the most indefensible passages in the work. The still more indefensible policy adopted by his opponents of depriving him of his University degree, by an act of judicial legislation, called out the collective power of so much of the Church party as belonged to Oxford; and though they were outvoted, their united action tended (though in an unpopular cause) to consolidate their forces. On the other hand, the veto by which the proctors so courageously disposed of a needless condemnation of Tract 90, elicited an address from all shades of Oxford High Churchmen, which served as another roll-call of the party in one University. The Littlemore section meanwhile grew more and more decided, and culminated in the 'Lives of the British Saints.' Mr. Oakeley capped Mr. Ward by his claim to 'hold all Roman doctrine.' Mr. Ward in turn married and seceded. Mr. Newman's self-imposed period of probation drew to a close, and the crash of 1845 came. Ward, Newman, Oakeley, Faber, and other somewhat conspicuous names followed one after another with a quick succession into the Roman fold. Shaken as the cause and the party necessarily were by the secession of so many men of note, they not only maintained their lost ground, but even acquired fresh territory.

The secession of Mr. Newman corresponded with the consecration of S. Saviour's, Leeds; and the occasion was chosen for a great

muster of the forces, although unfortunately the coincidence of these and other subsequent events tended to create alienations not confined to that place, the existence of which had better be regretted than revived. Besides, the Church party had at last secured its own journalistic organ. For about two or three years, the *English Churchman*, which started in 1843, after an abortive attempt on the part of Mr. Gathercole, was conducted with vigour and breadth of mind, and filled up the void very satisfactorily. Gradually, however, that paper became crotchety, and more than crotchety; but in the meanwhile the *Guardian* had been set on foot, and has ever since maintained a position of respectability, sense, and talent, to which we yield our grateful and sincere homage. In our earlier days, as a monthly magazine, we flatter ourselves that the *Christian Remembrancer* was not useless to the rising cause and party. The extinction of the *British Critic* cleared the way for some new Quarterly to take its place, and we stepped forward in a new form. Simultaneously another Review was started, also claiming to speak in the name of the Church cause. Unhappily this long defunct contemporary, the *English Review*, added no permanent strength to the common stock. Though ably supported, at first it began with being timid, it degenerated into utter suspicion and faint-heartedness, and it ended in a few years with something like abandoning the cause at a most critical moment, and then expired. Besides much injury to Churchmanship, it tended to throw out of the active service of the party and the cause abilities and learning which had been at one time honoured and energetic.

With the dissolution of Parliament by Lord John Russell, in 1847, a fresh chapter of our history commences. The wounds of 1845 had begun to heal over, and the Church cause was thriving in its visible work and practical exertions. Mr. Edward Coleridge, for example, had stirred up all hearts by his noble scheme (the correlative of the Colonial Bishops movement) of a Missionary College, commenced indeed before the secessions, but not interrupted by them, which had already found its *locale* at Canterbury. Similar projects on various sides were daily gaining strength, and Churchmen were saying to each other, 'Once we thought it would have been all up with the Church cause when Mr. Newman went; but see the difference.'

Mr. Gladstone's election for Oxford, at the general election of 1847, was assuredly one of the triumphs of Churchmanship. Lord John Russell's erection of the see of Manchester had gained him popularity. At this conjuncture the aged and munificent Archbishop of York unexpectedly died, and the translation of his successor left the see of Hereford vacant. To this see the

potential commander of the Channel Fleet chose, of all men living, to appoint Dr. Hampden, in order, as he phrased it in a letter to certain remonstrants (Lord John Russell is great in letters), 'to strengthen the Protestant character of our Church, 'so seriously threatened of late by many defections to the 'Church of Rome.' This audacious act consolidated and invigorated the Church party, which had now, for the first time since 1833, the good opportunity of a united demonstration; the first Hampden, the Tract 90, and the Ward affairs having been exclusively Oxford movements, and the last of them fought on a very unlucky issue. Few of our readers will have forgotten the gallant struggle which came to a dead-lock, not a defeat, in an equally divided Court of Queen's Bench. Dr. Hampden was Bishop of Hereford, and the Church party was fairly in the field. At this moment, the death of Archbishop Howley tended to inspire vigour into its counsels. Though the extreme Oxford section had been accustomed to make indiscriminate sport of the old High Church party, yet their merri- ment did not enlist a large circle of sympathisers; and none but the most flippant could fail to draw the distinction between the bucolic specimens of easy-going 'parsons,' who still lingered in various counties, and the deep-read, though very cautious divines, who had been the leaders of orthodoxy before the Tracts were dreamed of. The natural recoil from the secessions of 1845 of course tended to augment the influence of these more ancient leaders; and in 1846 and 1847, until the Hampden excitement, the Church party rested under the hegemony of Archbishop Howley and Bishop Blomfield, backed by the *grand seigneur* influence of the still more aged Archbishop Harcourt, the princely Beresford of Armagh, the *vivida vis* of the Bishop of Exeter, and the energy of the recently consecrated Bishop of Oxford, the five first, in their respective ways, grand specimens of the old school, the last a man born to lead in the new generation. But Archbishop Howley followed Archbishop Harcourt in a few weeks to the grave, and the metropolitanical thrones were filled up by prelates especially selected by Lord John Russell, with the view of making himself disagreeable to the Church party, and that party accordingly felt itself thrown upon its own resources, just at a crisis when it had the spirit and the will to act for itself. The bench of Bishops still contained tried men of scholarly renown, and worthy of all respect. But its 'High Church' nuance was gone. The Newman lead, as we have seen, had long ceased. The subsequent phase of a deference to the episcopate, from its personal no less than its official qualifications, was not so easy a task as it had been a little before. A new phenomenon manifested itself, and a new period of excitement

began, during which more completely than either before or afterwards a Church 'party' existed.

The circumstances of the Hampden affair had brought together leading Churchmen, lay and clerical, in frequent and confidential consultation. Those whose head-quarters were London, met men of ability and earnestness from the country, and naturally desired that the intimacy so erected might not be allowed to cool. Parenthetically it may be observed, that an unusually large proportion of the country Churchmen who assembled on the occasion came from the dioceses of Gloucester and Bristol, and of Bath and Wells; the city of Bristol being at the time a very important centre of Churchmanship. For several years, too, that Management Clauses fight had gone on at the annual meeting of the National Society, which ended in a virtual triumph to the spirit rather than the letter of the Church party's plea, and which, we believe, taught the officials of that day the lesson which they have not yet forgotten, that there is a Church in England, and that Englishmen will not stand bureaucracy, especially in the matter of education. A 'minister of education' was the lowest possible depth of evil then grimly hinted at on the part of the Church champions, particularly the energetic Mr. Denison. A minister of education has since been created, and he fulfils the useful, though it may not be heroic task, of moving education grants every year, out of which the Church reaps by far the greatest profit. Accordingly, the result of the continual meetings was that a scheme was started, which ought to have been thought of years before, to create a species of voluntary 'Church Cabinet'—a council of Churchmen, lay and clerical, of proved capacity, who should exercise a central influence in London, on Church matters, over a Church party which was willing to accord to it its confidence. Accordingly, 1848 saw the creation of what was called the 'Watching Committee on Church Matters,' sitting in London, but including virtual representatives of local Churchmanship. The functions of this body were strictly those of deliberation and advice, with a special view to the parliamentary and political fortunes of the Church; and while no name was put upon its list whose Churchmanship was not above suspicion, it was so formed as to combine theologians, lawyers, and men of the public world, deliberating in the same committee on terms of equality. During the preceding year, a similar movement, but of a more popular complexion, had been going on at Bristol (which was then, as we have said, a sort of second centre of Churchmanship), resulting in the formation of the famous Bristol Church Union, a society differing from the Watching Committee in having a general body, which met, deliberated, and elected the

governing committee. Church Unions at Gloucester and elsewhere were soon created in imitation of the one at Bristol. To all these institutions the Watching Committee stood in the position of a central and controlling body; the leaders of the local unions were, generally speaking, enrolled on its list; and the most perfect harmony existed between the London and the country organization. A new want, however, made itself felt in the capital itself. The general Church public of London had no deliberative machinery. Whether a *permanent* voluntary machinery for deliberation in London were a desirable and judicious thing at that time was another matter; it was also a question, which might reasonably have admitted of doubt, how far the peculiar and deliberate functions of the Watching Committee were consistent with a perpetual overlooking by a general body, or with the principle of existing upon the tenure of periodical re-election at the hands of that body. There were, in fact, three questions to be dealt with,—whether a Church Union for London on the Bristol plan were desirable, whether that Union ought to exist independently of, but in subordination to, the Watching Committee, or whether it ought to be its emanation. The last alternative was adopted, and by 1849 the transformation of the Watching Committee into the ‘London Union on Church Matters’ was complete. In framing its new constitution (for the Watching Committee itself created the constitution on which it admitted a general body), it strove to maintain in the ‘Committee’ of the ‘Union’ the purposes for which it originally existed as a cabinet. It was, to be sure, liable to annual re-election; but it ran the risk of the rejection of a house-list, and it reserved to itself unlimited power of adding to its numbers during the twelvemonth of office. Although the ‘Corresponding Societies’ Act,’ in the opinion of its legal members, who were several of them judges of the land and eminent barristers, forbade any formal representative organization, it took pains to make itself virtually representative, by placing on its list, more extensively than before, the prominent officers and members of local unions, and active Churchmen in districts where no union existed. It extended the same principle to the composition of its general body, and gave it to be understood that it solicited recruits from all parts of the country. To avoid invidia, while it appointed a permanent treasurer and secretary, it did not name, and never has named, any permanent president or chairman; although for many years one honoured member has always, when present, filled the chair. On the committee appeared the names of judges and Regius Professors, peers and members of Parliament, squires and dignitaries, distinguished teachers of the Oxford school, and leaders of the

'old' High Church party, all heartily engaged in the same good cause.

Now, it must be acknowledged that a Church Society so organized, if it had simply gone before the world upon a constitution such as we have described it, however righteous and justifiable in itself—and under the actual circumstances of the cause, we fully believe it was both—it would have symbolized the energy rather than the discipline of Churchmanship. But behind the printed lists of the Union committee and general body stood a personage grave in dignity. The committee formally submitted its rules to the Bishop of London, Dr. Blomfield; and he not only entirely approved them, after a careful revision, but allowed himself to be considered as the patron of them; acutely and good-humouredly observing that he treated the Society as 'Mr. Union,' and justified it in acting as any single Churchman might do under similar circumstances. Bishop Blomfield was the diocesan of the head-quarters of this Union; he was a distinguished statesman no less than prelate, and his then twenty-one years' episcopate of a see, metropolitical all but in name, gave him a weight which did not at once attach to the ecclesiastical dignitary of higher precedence. His patronage of the London Union, which was made no secret, was the one thing needed to consolidate its position. The country unions, at the same time, were, for the most part, fortunate in obtaining the approbation, more or less pronounced, of their respective diocesans.

The Church party so organized had only itself to blame for not being able to make the fullest use of its opportunities. But an unhappy schism followed upon the very heels of the 'London Union.' We approach this branch of our subject with great reluctance; some, indeed, of those who made themselves prominent in the opposition have since trained off from any public participation in the Church movement; others, however, are now combating for the same Church cause, thoroughly trusting in and trusted by those who were, eleven years ago, among the founders of the London Union; while some of them long joined its committee. They must forgive us for not being able to pass over so important an episode in our history. Somehow a society came into existence termed the Metropolitan Church Union: and—not to analyse causes more deeply—this association justified not so much its own existence as its open oppugnancy to the London Union upon the fact that that body would not, at the somewhat peremptory appeal of its rival's inchoate executive, alter its constitution (approved as it was by the Bishop) by the insertion of a categorical and specific declaration in favour of the revival of Convocation.

It may seem strange in 1860 for any society of Churchmen to have been unwilling to take such a step with or without five minutes' notice. But when it was urged, the Gorham judgment had not been delivered, nor the Papal Aggression taken place; and the question, which was one of policy, not of principle, as to whether the scope of the Union should be declared in general terms, or should include any specific objects, was one upon which persons with identical views might easily hold different opinions. The committee of the London Union were the last men to declare against the revival of Convocation, a revival which they themselves desired to promote, and they accordingly made no such declaration. They all looked forward to self-government as the thing to be ultimately compassed by the Church; but they considered that it was the more expedient course for them, situated as they then were, not to commit themselves in their laws—a public document—to this specific item of aggressive Churchmanship. Their policy in those laws was to stand on the defensive, rather than ostentatiously to demand any additional advantage. By so doing they considered that the real likelihood of obtaining such advantages peaceably and securely, would be insured. The requisition of the more impatient section was, be it noted, not for a private though official assurance of the strong desire on the part of the executive of the London Union for the re-establishment of representative or synodical action in the Church of England; this was heartily at their service; but for a specific change in its constitution—a constitution, as we have shown, framed under the eye of judges, and approved by the Bishop of London—enunciating the revival of Convocation at that time of day as a specific end of the Union's existence. The committee declined to alter its constitution at the requisition of a separatist and somewhat unfriendly body; and the 'Metropolitan Church Union' published itself as in direct rivalry to the 'London Union on Church matters.' A more unfortunate thought than that of organizing at such a moment a rival body, competing for the leadership of the Church cause and party, could not have crossed the human mind. The Church party, after many vicissitudes and severe trials, had at length found out the duty and the possibility of united action, and had entered upon it under the happiest auspices. It would have been but ordinary prudence to have waived even grave differences in favour of such a result. But in this case there was no fundamental difference of principle, only one of policy as in the face of a jealous public. However mistaken the minority might have considered the majority, their constitutional and judicious course, with the interests of the Church at stake, would have been that of a decided though

friendly opposition within the society itself, until they became a majority, accomplished a coalition, or were converted. They preferred hostility to opposition, and the unhappy results of their policy were not slow in appearing. The London Union was of course at once engaged in a contest, not with the opponents of the Church cause, but with the antagonistic competitor for the leadership of the Church party. The apparent taint of personal partisanship came out in all that it did, and in all that was done by the Metropolitan Union. The country Unions were naturally perplexed, and called upon the rivals to coalesce. The London Union, strong as it was in the broad representation of High Churchmanship of all shades upon its committee, and in the approbation given to its rules and to itself of the Bishop of London, which the other society had not been fortunate enough to win, could only offer to absorb that body upon terms honourable and advantageous to its individual members. It would not be absorbed; and although the country Unions strongly manifested their preference for, and confidence in, the earlier and more powerful body, the antagonistic organization still continued to exist, meet, speak, and publish.

1850 began with a brilliant Church demonstration—Mr. Talbot's public meeting in favour of Church education, arising out of the standing fight with the Government under Sir J. Kay Shuttleworth's inspirations. And the Bishop of London's attempted Church Discipline Bill was one of the best which has ever been essayed. March arrived, and the Gorham judgment startled society. The instinct of Churchmen was of course to fly to their arms, and, in face of the common calamity, personal considerations were out of the question. A very strong protest, signed by twelve influential names, was among the earliest notes of the battle—the paper testified to the gravity of the occasion, but its first clause on the eventual effect of the judgment was, we think, open to grave objections; the force of which became before very long painfully apparent. Protests upon protests multiplied: the frequency and numbers of the meetings of the general body of the London Union converted it into a sort of ecclesiastical parliament in London. The Bishop of Exeter's letter to the Archbishop of Canterbury, which was speedily published, ruled of course the policy of the Church party. The Bishop of London's refusal to acquiesce in the judgment enhanced his already strong claims on Churchmen for their gratitude and confidence. A short published letter of his to a prominent lay member of the London Union, clearly laying down the duty of patient persistence in the Church of England, and pointing to Convocation, attracted much attention. At length a strong feeling became apparent for a great public meeting in London

to protest against the judgment, and a joint committee of the London and Metropolitan Unions was constituted to organize it. The policy of such a step was of course canvassed in various ways. A monster meeting is always an easy way for men who do not really care for their responsibilities to get out of their obligations to their constituents in a blaze of meaningless invective. But those whose whole hearts were absorbed by that crisis, were not the people to act in this perfunctory way. It might seem to the bystanders that those who were the most really earnest for the Church cause were the men who pressed the strongest for the meeting; the lukewarm, those who hesitated. But any one who might have so supposed, would have judged harshly; there was, in fact, a strong underlying divergence of intention in the minds of those who with more or less eagerness desired the meeting. There were some who simply obeyed the unreasoning afflatus of doing something energetic to enliven an intolerable oppression, or pacify an equally painful irritation of spirits; others, listening to nothing but their own enthusiasm, had persuaded themselves that the meeting could not fail to be so numerous and so determined as to be, in effect, a physical triumph for the Church's cause; others hugged the notion, that however much involved the Church of England might be in the judgment, yet a collective protest against it would not only purge their own individual consciences of complicity in it, but go far to purge the corporate Church also. Others were unable to see how a mere voluntary assemblage, whose success was still uncertain, would mend or mar the Church of England's formal position; but were at the same time anxious not only to give a vent to their own and brother Churchmen's feeling of grief and indignation, but also—supposing there to be a reasonable prospect of success—to turn the meeting to practical and politic account, by showing the strength of the Church party, and making a public demand for that synodical action, of the necessity of which in some form all shades of real Churchmen had become convinced. Finally, there was a small party, the existence of which some persons suspected more than others, who had already gone far in losing faith in the Church of England, and who (unconsciously, we are willing to believe, to themselves) were anxious for the meeting as a sort of summing up of accounts, a last effort, of which the incomplete success, according to their measure of completeness, might justify any ulterior steps.

The Romeward tendency involved in these feelings was sufficiently apparent to raise alarm, but their danger to the cause (whatever that might have been) did not at first so much rest upon the fear of any extensive defection to the Church of Rome,

as upon the vague desire which possessed many minds, even those who were ordinarily cool, judicial, and moderate, in favour of an orthodox 'free Church' of England, which would live on, alongside of the Establishment, peaceful within and determined in its attitude towards all outside. Less enthusiastic Churchmen shook their heads, some from the strong conviction of the essentially schismatic character of the scheme, others from the practical recollection of the history of Nonjurism. These aspirations of course died away, after having produced nothing more tangible than the letter in favour of union with the Greek Church which appeared in Scotland: but the existence of such a tone of thought was not a thing to be ignored by those upon whom the responsibility of the future meeting rested.

It is not betraying confidence to say that in the joint committee the eagerness for the meeting was originally stronger on the part of the representatives of the Metropolitan than of the London Union. The meeting had been advertised for June 27, when the Church world was suddenly startled by the announcement that a resolution had been taken to postpone it. In a few days, it was announced that the postponement was not *sine die*, but only till July 23, on which day effectively it came off. Few people are probably aware of the full motives of those who carried this postponement. It was neither timidity nor was it any wavering of faith in the Church of England, but the reverse. Not to speak of the impropriety of meeting at a time when the Bishop of Exeter was still fighting in the courts of common law, it had become apparent to their minds, although in a form so impalpable as to render the breathing of any such suspicion in the highest degree unjustifiable, that a subtle influence had been at work, and was gaining a strong ascendancy in the joint councils, which seemed to be hardly consistent with strict abiding faith in the actual Church of England, whether it ultimately led to the ideal 'free' Church, or to the so-called '*caput urbis et orbis*.' What was more perplexing was, that this influence seemed to be active with that section of the body whose Anglicanism was the most unduly suspicious of others' steadfastness, but which had unfortunately suspected in the wrong direction. Practically, too, the arrangements were woefully behindhand, and there was very great risk that the gathering might have turned out a *mêlée*. A few persons, accordingly, keeping their graver suspicions to themselves, persuaded the joint committee, upon strong practical grounds, to the postponement, the motion being made by one whose absence from England for several months and then recent return enabled him to form a cooler and more dispassionate estimate of the state of matters than others, who had for weeks been at a fever heat of excitement. By so doing they

knowingly subjected themselves to the imputation of covert motives; but they submitted to the charge with cheerfulness, convinced, as they were, that they had done the best thing to save the Church movement at that crisis from imminent though concealed peril.

The success of the meeting surpassed the expectations of all moderate men. It had not of course any visible effect on Parliament or the Episcopal Bench; but it was no common event to behold two large public halls, S. Martin's and Freemasons', filled simultaneously with crowded assemblages of gentle and noble, prelate, dignitary, and lord, layman and priest, presenting the rare example of deep feeling controlled by perfect propriety and the sense of the unseen, under the influence of oratory the more powerful because it came from and spoke to the heart. The resolutions adopted were clear and practical; they protested against the judgment doctrinally, and they pointed to Convocation as the only source from which an efficient remedy could be sought. Some things might have been said in the speeches which had better have been avoided, but in face of such a triumph men were not disposed to be critical. Mr. Hubbard's able Chairmanship at S. Martin's Hall greatly conduced to the success. The public press of all shades of opinion was the best witness to the good results of the day, for we believe that without an exception it treated the meeting with respect, however angry many of the journals may have been.

The Church party seemed at that moment on the point of a cordial and perfect consolidation, when an event took place, of small account in itself, indeed, but one which justified the fears and again stirred up the suspicions of the two sections of that joint committee which had conducted the meeting. Under the influence of the 'Metropolitan' section, the second meeting in Freemasons' Hall—an almost *extempore* phase of the demonstration—was, by a very hasty choice, placed under the chairmanship of a young nobleman, of a most amiable character, but not conspicuous for stirring talents, who seemed to give the desired guarantee of 'No-popery,' from his having been, only three years before, the almost successful 'anti-Maynooth' opponent of Mr. Goulburn for the University of Cambridge. Just six weeks after the meeting, Churchmen were startled with the intelligence that Lord Feilding had joined the Church of Rome, and that at the time he presided over one of these great meetings his faith in the English Communion was, though he declared it not, vitally shaken. Some persons felt more than they liked to express how painfully this unexpected secession justified their fears of an occult influence distracting the councils of those who honestly thought themselves the special bulwarks against any

Romanising tendencies. It was not to be supposed that these persons took the same view of their own mistake, and accordingly the weekly paper which was then the organ of their particular colour of Churchmanship declared, in announcing Lord Feilding's secession, that 'it is high time for the true-hearted friends of the Church to look about them, and demand of all who claim a place in their ranks, whatever may be their station or character, a solemn pledge of determined antagonism to Rome, and faithful adherence to the doctrine and communion of the truly Catholic and Apostolic Church of England.' The meaning of these words was not long doubtful; for notice of motion was given in the Bristol Church Union (which still held its given position of second leading body in the Church party), by the Rev. W. Palmer,—one whose early services make his then policy and his later silence matter of deep regret,—of a voluntary test, including an anti-Roman declaration, over and above the repudiation of Roman error which runs through all the symbolical writings of the English Church. The persons at whose head this missile was aimed felt equally indignant at an imputation against themselves which they knew to be groundless, and alarmed at the suspicious and suicidal policy of multiplying voluntary and superfluous tests beyond and beside the basis of the Church itself. There was, accordingly, a great gathering of forces at Bristol, on October 1st; and after a spirited debate (in which no one took part who has not ever since remained firm to the Church of England), the test was rejected by an overwhelming majority, in favour of a carefully drawn amendment; and so the leadership of the 'London' section was accepted and confirmed by what was virtually a representative meeting of the Church party. A crowded meeting of the London Union itself, in a few days, reasserted the amendment, brought forward by the committee as a substantive motion, and the country bodies followed the example.

Satisfactory as the result was to those Churchmen who proved to be the majority, the painful feeling remained that the victory of one side was the defeat of the other, and that the inevitable result must be to perpetuate, for the present, not merely an opposition, but a split in that which ought to have been an undivided party. Still, there seemed to be again the prospect of ultimate and peaceful consolidation, the only apparent rock ahead being the threatened repetition of the secessions of 1845—an event for which the world had been partly prepared by such pamphlets as those of Mr. Allies and Mr. Maskell on the Supremacy, although the precise extent to which the sapping of leading theological minds had gone was not generally suspected. Besides the rally made by Churchmen during

the summer of 1850, in defence of sacramental doctrine, the synodical question had been brought before the Lords by Lord Redesdale, and before the Commons by Mr. Gladstone, in reference to the Colonial Church; and the season had been for London one of remarkable and cheering progress in the ritualistic and devotional revival; witnessing as it had done, within a very few weeks, the successive consecrations of S. Stephen', Shepherd's Bush (the offering of the Bishop himself); S. Barnabas', Pimlico; S. Stephen', Rochester Row; S. Mary's, Crown Street. Suddenly, without preparation, a thunderbolt fell, and everything seemed in an instant reduced to chaos. On Michaelmas-day, two days before the Bristol meeting, Pius IX. had signed the unlucky Brief *Universalis Ecclesiæ*, and the kingdom went mad about the Papal Aggression.

The first phase of the hurly-burly was, that although Churchmen had just learned so sharp a lesson in the Gorham judgment, as to the evils of Erastianism, and the perils of an undue stretch of the 'Supremacy,' and although at every meeting throughout the year they had declared, deeper and deeper, their determination to resist this pressing danger to the utmost, they yet allowed themselves, to a great degree, to be so carried off by contagious excitement, as in considerable numbers to protest against the aggression in language and for reasons which absolutely committed the protesters to the most unmitigated recognition of the Erastian bondage of our Church. This was bad enough; but the panic began to slacken, and Churchmen to return to their wits, when the *émeute* took another turn. Early in November, the Bishop of London delivered his quadriennial charge; and in this document, after having most fully and satisfactorily treated of the Gorham judgment, he proceeded to speak of ritualistic development in language of strong unexpected rebuke, and in a tone which looked very like personality. Churchmen did not know what to make of this outburst; the circumstances which led to it (mistake as it was) were not at the time apparent, and it was doubtless written before the 'Papal aggression' had flayed alive the public mind. But it fell at an unlucky moment; for Lord John Russell, snatching at its expressions with tortuous and greedy ingenuity, caricatured and exaggerated them in his infamous and incendiary Durham Letter, claiming the Bishop of London as on his side. Then

'Limitibus ruptis infert se spumeus amnis.'

The Pope and Cardinal Wiseman soon became secondary persons compared with the persecuted 'Tractarians.' S. Barnabas, beset with riotous mobs, worse even than those who have defiled

S. George's-in-the-East this year, was the central object of an interest every day more painful, only relieved by the broad burlesque of Lord Ashley's impertinent anti-ritualistic meeting at Freemasons' Hall, where he expressed his desire for *al fresco* worship with Lydia 'on the banks of the river side,' or chequered by the mendacious circular of the National Club to the churchwardens of England, in which the confession escaped that Churchmen were a 'large party,' an acknowledgment worked to the utmost in a series of letters on Church matters in the *Morning Chronicle*, which were then commenced; when the incredible news was bruited abroad that the Bishop of London had called on Mr. Bennett to resign, and that Mr. Bennett perforce must go. A more painful blunder never was committed by public man than what the good, and we will add great, Bishop Blomfield committed on that occasion. The excuse for him, we truly believe, is to be found in the significant expression that he had lost, for the instant, his head—a pardonable though deplorable loss on the part of an aging man, overtaxed with responsibilities at a season of universal mania. The Bishop, an old High Churchman, had not been unwilling to head the men of the revival in many a gallant contest, but he was constitutionally unable to face anything like public opposition. He was a great general; but incapable of meeting a disaster or a check. He had often, indeed, given his friends somewhat rough rebukes; but that was in accordance with his rather boisterous though kind-hearted nature. He meant less malice than many men who never gave knocks so hard. Though he respected art and ritualism, his studies had not led him beyond an elementary acquaintance with them. However, he tolerated much more than he would personally have adopted; and yet, as, for instance, in his own church at Shepherd's Bush, he did substantially adopt the main features of the ecclesiological revival. His largest act of toleration was S. Barnabas. Unfortunately, at S. Barnabas, he was brought into contact with a person who never could understand him, and whom the Bishop reciprocally could not understand. Mr. Bennett, it must be confessed, with all his high claims upon the respect and admiration of Churchmen, has, unhappily, an unconciliatory strain in his character, which made itself specially apparent in his dealings with the Bishop. He might, we believe, have perfectly managed his somewhat exigent, but not naturally inimical diocesan; he contrived instead to aggravate him at the time he was composing his charge, and wound up an inconsidered correspondence by that most unwise act of placing his conditional resignation in the Bishop's hands. The Bishop, thoroughly frightened by the mobs at the church, was injudicious enough

to avail himself of the power so irregularly placed at his disposal, without, we believe, any other object than the immediate and narrow one of restoring public peace.

He had, however, totally misapprehended and miscalculated the state of the public and of the Church mind. Mr. Bennett's dismissal could not but be taken in connexion with the Durham Letter, the Lydian meeting, and similar outrages; and in one day, sad to say, the Bishop lost the confidence of the Church party, to which, since the Gorham judgment, he exclusively belonged, and found himself in the unfortunate predicament, that, dealing with an angered and unaccommodating antagonist, he was unable to escape from his false position. An incidental evil of the catastrophe was a breach between the Bishop and the London Union on Church Matters, which felt itself compelled to express its sympathy with Mr. Bennett.

We hurry over the events of the first quarter of 1851. The frantic onslaught on ritualism ended in smoke; the compromising declaration of nearly all the episcopal bench did neither the harm nor the good that was anticipated: Lord John Russell went out to come in again a crippled minister, and pressed his puerile Ecclesiastical Titles Bill forward in the midst of the undisguised contempt of all thinking men. At Easter appeared the Bishop of Exeter's Pastoral, a document embracing in language of the keenest point and yet most sustained dignity, and with a tone of unyielding Churchmanship, a *précis* of the entire fortunes of the whole Church cause during the preceding eventful year, and ending with the announcement of his intention to hold a Diocesan Synod in the following summer; and a publication and a policy both of them so bold fairly took away the breath of antagonistic parties. The Synod was held, and its proceedings fully justified the expectations with which it had been called.

With this Synod was closed the Gorham-Wiseman chapter of the history of the Church cause and of the Church party. Although, of course, the obnoxious judgment remained unrevoked, its practical result had been to awaken a deeper and wider conviction of baptismal doctrine in the minds of English Churchmen than had previously existed. The Russell-Ashley aggression against the worship of the Church had also come to nought. Churchmen were united in the conviction of the necessity of proximate synodical action in the Church of England. In one word, the bark of the Church cause had weathered the storm, although in its passage through the rocks and quicksands she had lost a few valued members of the crew, who had thrown themselves overboard, and swum for what they believed was the safe haven of Rome.

But the Church party was not the same calm collected body which it had shown itself upon the 23d of July. The two preceding seasons had been times of frightful and abnormal excitement. It could not have been otherwise. As in seasons of political revolution 'clubs' became a necessity of general life, so had meetings, speeches, pamphlets, and counter-pamphlets become the daily sustenance of the Church party. Now came the difficulty for its leaders to keep up the *esprit de corps*, and yet withhold the continuous stimulant which was no longer necessary and would have been deleterious. The country was studded with Church Unions: what was to be the business carved out for them? The general body of the London Union was a 'Demus,' reposing indeed great confidence in its committee, but still a Demus. That committee, while regulating the enthusiasm of its followers, had never forgotten its original condition of a self-elected watching Church cabinet, and it had never ceased to consider this function as of extreme importance. The *Guardian* and the *Morning Chronicle* (which had become a professed organ of Churchmanship, and so continued for several years) laboured to keep up the spirit of the party, and yet to regulate its ardour; and in both these papers the committee of the London Union was regarded as the central authority. The Metropolitan Union did not, indeed, cease to exist, but it gradually retired into obscurity beside the 'Society for the Revival of Convocation,' established indeed in the *locale* of that Union, but possessing none of the features of oppugnancy by which the Metropolitan was characterised; a society, in short, which undertook one great specific practical work, and has most perseveringly and successfully carried out its mission. Not even the persons who alleged the ambiguity of the London Union in 1849 as to Convocation could now find fault with its zeal in that cause. We believe it did much to foster the revival of the Convocation of Canterbury; but, when we say so, we gladly acknowledge the special claims of the other body which existed for that one specified end. Convocation was openly, ever since the great meeting, a most important end of the London Union, but it had many others of great moment besides. Contemporaneously with the revival of the Convocation of Canterbury, as a deliberative assembly, which came to pass in the autumn of 1852, the Colonial Church, in its different dioceses, began its successful agitation for a synodical government which should be legislative as well as deliberative. This movement did not fall within the scope of the Convocation Society; but the committee of the London Union, in its occasional reports, made itself the mouthpiece of the home Church party upon the synodical cause in the colonies. A new com-

plication grew out of this policy. There was not a single colony into whose synodical assembly the laity were not called to bear their part. The same question of laity in Synod was raised on Scottish ground in Mr. Gladstone's letter to Primus Skinner; and the English deputation to the General Convention of the American Church in 1853 brought the spectacle of active representative government in a mixed assembly of clergy and laity prominently before the eyes of Churchmen. The London Union could not avoid having an opinion upon the question, and that which it sustained was in favour, although very moderately expressed, of a place being found for the laity in Church assemblies. The controversy which this raised ranged over a considerable time, and we have no desire to recall its vicissitudes or rake up its embers. The letters on Church matters in the *Morning Chronicle*, by D.C.L., took up the lay side; Mr. Cleveland Coxe came forward in vindication of the American Church. Mr. Gladstone was answered in a pamphlet by 'Cautus,' a signature supposed to conceal a name of great weight; and, later, Dr. Pusey appeared on the anti-lay side with his 'Ancient Precedents.' The immediate effect upon the London Union committee was to lose for it support, the absence of which it much regretted, and which it would have gladly retained, and, as it thought, did enough to retain by dropping the controversy as far as it was concerned. Without attempting to grapple with the actual dispute, we think that the section who supported the lay side were somewhat hardly dealt with. The opponents of the admission of the laity to representative rights took up grounds most assuredly sound in themselves. They argued against the risk of the doctrine of the Church being left to chance majorities, or causes of faith being subjected to the judicial determination of elected, possibly ignorant, or ill-disposed judges. They appealed to the absence of proof as to laymen ever having sat in ancient Synods. The reply to these allegations was the admission of their truth, with a reservation as to the known influence in councils of the early Christian emperors, and the constant presence of lay assessors, being arguments from analogy on the side of the laity; and with the further allegation that all which the pro-lay party wished for might be effected without detriment to the principles which these statements involved. In fact, the whole matter, they said, was a confusion of terms arising out of the use of the word 'Synod.' They had no particular and exclusive love for that word, but it happened to have come to hand on both sides as the current term to express a formal meeting for the regulation of Church concerns.

The old Synods, when printing was unknown, and travelling

slow, costly, and hazardous, were exceptional gatherings, and acted either as Church courts to try supposed offenders against doctrine or discipline, or in the analogous capacity of constituent assemblies, to decree canons of faith and discipline. By all means, said they, preserve and reserve sacredly and exclusively these functions to the *clerum*. Call the meetings which settle them Synods or courts, as you like best. But after you have preserved and reserved everything which you can prove has ever come within the prerogatives of any primitive or mediæval Synod, you will find that the Church of this writing, printing, discussing, travelling, statistical age is eyes-deep in a complication of business, secular in all its details, and only ecclesiastical in as much as it refers to the Church. You have your Christian Knowledge Society, your Propagation of the Gospel and Church Missionary Societies, your National Society, your General and Diocesan Church Building Societies, your Additional Curates' Society, your Sons of the Clergy, your Clergy Provident Society—you have most of them sitting in London, and the permanent correlatives of all these associations in every county and diocese. In the administration of all and every one of these bodies, laymen are solicited to take a part, and do so accordingly. Of several of them, laymen have been the founders; and yet all and every one of them is an institution created most laudably, but upon the strictest Church principles somewhat irregularly, to fill a special gap in what ought to be the general representative organization of the Church. Above all things, consider how Parliament, an assembly which is now totally unconnected with the Church, meddles with all Church matters even the most sacred.

And so—continued to argue the advocates of the lay cause—what we ask for is not an extension of, but a restriction upon, these existing privileges of the laity. We want some general regulating representative system, composed exclusively of clergy and of *communicants* (communicating being, as far as we can learn, the test in *no* religious society), not to supersede, which would be equally wrong and inexpedient, but to 'regularize' these various associations. No clerical synod, as they urged, ever sat without a legal assessor, no clerical synod ever kept accounts without some financial agent: why then forbid Church lawyers, and Church bankers and merchants, to make themselves useful in their own particular line? We do not care, they said, for the word synod—away with it, for these mixed assemblies, call them what you please, conventions or standing committees—and reserve 'Synod' and 'Convocation' for the existing or any future clerical assemblies; only do not in these suspicious, susceptible times, when the standing charge against

the Church party—that of ‘priestcraft’—is so rife, show such a jealousy of the well-disposed section of Churchmen as would inevitably give colour to that most undesirable, not to say fatal, imputation. Especially do not tax us with the desire to ‘Americanise’ the Church of England, when the essence of our claim is, that communion, and not the indiscriminate something called ‘Church-membership,’ should be the qualification for a seat in the united assembly, and when we uphold as strongly as you the episcopal veto in diocesan gatherings. All guarantees which, in point of form, you would desire, we will give—in conclusion, we never dreamed of any system of voting which would not give a substantive collective vote, and therefore a veto to the representatives of the clergy, even in questions referring exclusively to the secular accidents of the Church. Whether or not the lay section of the Society made out their case by arguments such as those which we have recapitulated, is not for us to decide. We wish, however, that their opponents had taken more pains to deal with them *seriatim*, instead of intrenching themselves within the precedents of an epoch on which representative government, and the liberty of speech in the modern sense of both words, had no existence. We believe that if a free conference of the leaders of both sides could have been held, an agreement satisfactory to both might have been arrived at. Such, unfortunately, never took place, and a diversity of opinion grew up, which, we fear, has been the cause of much of the want of corporate action in the Church party ever since that time. Under what different auspices the question has been now lately raised, we will in due course proceed to show.

Politics unhappily played their part also in dividing the Church party. It was a day of triumph for Exeter Hall when high Churchmen, even those in whose behalf the eloquent voice of our greatest orator had been raised in the House of Commons, came forward to support Mr. Dudley Perceval—himself a high Churchman, and of the highest personal respectability—as Mr. Gladstone’s opponent, on that eminent statesman accepting office at the close of 1852 as Lord Aberdeen’s Chancellor of the Exchequer. We do not raise the point whether Lord Derby or Lord Aberdeen were the better minister for the Church; but we are decidedly of opinion that it would have been an equal mistake for all the members of the Church party to have attached themselves to one side or to the other. They have in practice not done so, and the result is that the Church cause has good friends on both sides of the two houses. But it was the worst mistake of all to make Mr. Gladstone’s joining the coalition Cabinet a reason for withholding from him the confidence of

Churchmen, on the old-fashioned idea of Churchman and Tory being correlative terms.

Another and a better reason for the comparative inertness of members of the Church party, existed in the renewed vitality of Convocation. Why should we, they asked, continue irregular assemblages, such as the Church Unions, when our regular Church Parliament for the southern province at least has begun to sit and to deliberate? This question might have been more difficult to answer had the Church of England been one in doctrine and in discipline. But as she is not so, but that on the contrary almost every disputed election for Convocation is one between the high and the low Church candidate, it is the common sense policy of party warfare to maintain organizations which, if nothing else, would tend to keep together the electoral body to come to the poll and send the right man to Convocation. Besides, even the best possible Convocation would be the better for a good outside public opinion; and some regulating body must exist, if the right of petition to Convocation and to Parliament is not to be disused or abused. For these and many similar reasons, Church Unions, so far from being a superfluity in the early days of revived Convocation, would have been a most valuable auxiliary institution.

The combined result of the various causes which we have recapitulated was, that from about 1852 or 1853 the rank and file of the London Union began gradually to fall off, and the local unions to suffer in like manner, while the numbers who could be brought together to extraordinary committee meetings was not, ordinarily speaking, as large as previously. One element of the Committee's strength did not lose heart or assiduity—that nucleus of its somewhat long list (a list long because representative of the whole body), on which from the first the chief burden of its administrative and literary work has fallen. Season after season, year after year, has this nucleus met, and has done all that it was in its power to do, in face of the failing numbers and flagging interest of the general body. The true blame, if blame there be, for any comparative inertness with which it might be charged, is due, not to this nucleus, but to the general body, for without their support the Committee must of course be comparatively powerless. In the original days of the 'Watching Committee on Church Matters,' that Watching Committee of course relied for its power upon the *understood* support of the Church party. When the Watching Committee grew into the London Union, that understood support was changed into a formal one, in the shape of membership involving a slight subscription, with certain corresponding advantages. Among these advantages were occasional general meetings

for the purpose of electing members and receiving reports, making motions, and discussion. Still the administration of Church interests was intended to be left to the committee, subject to its annual re-election, and the committee was on that very account unlimited in numbers, and composed upon a virtually representative system. The parliamentary mode of debate could be fully carried out, as it was during the excitement years 1849—51, at the crowded gatherings of that body, often more numerous than many a Colonial House of Assembly. The difficulty might have been whether the committee itself was not too large to be a proper cabinet; but the mutual forbearance and friendly feeling towards each other of its members avoided this danger. From the general meetings, on the other hand, composed as they were of all subscribing members, without any test of administrative capacity, it was fair to expect confidence in the judgment and *bona fides* of the committee. We are able most unhesitatingly to say that this confidence as a rule was freely accorded, and that on no occasion where there was any difference manifested during the general meetings, was the committee ever left in a minority. Still the excitement years had left their mark behind. There was a sort of vague feverish feeling among Churchmen that unless public meetings were going on nothing was being done. In this feeling the committee could not participate, although, whenever a meeting was held, they did their best to be prepared with a report of sterling interest to the Church cause. At the same time, they felt that it was the best policy to calm down the excitement, and not encourage it by creating unnecessary work for deliberative public meetings, and so converting the Union into a debating society. Such commotions, for example, as the Westerton-Fitzroy *fracas* at S. Paul's, Knightsbridge, did not in their eyes constitute a *casus* for calling the forces to arms. In fact, we may as well be plain, and state fairly that, with the reserve of exceptional services, the really most important work of the general body was to contribute the funds necessary to work the institution. As we have said, and now repeat at the risk of tedium, the Committee was so large as to be itself representative; besides, the cases in which the Church cause was in any peril were precisely those in which private counsels were usually more important than deliberations which might and sometimes did find their way into the *Morning Advertiser*. Any private member, moreover, had the amplest means of bringing his views and suggestions before the Committee by letter, and never missed, when he did so, receiving the fullest attention. On the other hand, for the maintenance of an effective 'Watching Committee,' whether so called, or for what was termed the Committee of a

Church Union, funds were needed—a place where the committee, and, from time to time, the general body, could meet, was indispensable—an office at which the secretary could always be available for members passing through town was also of great importance; correspondence and printing could not be carried on for nothing; services such as those which the secretary rendered deserved their acknowledgment. For all these objects there were but two available sources of income,—the large donations of a few persons, and the moderate subscriptions of a large circle of members. The subscriptions were purposely fixed very low, in order to bring in as many members as possible; and the consequence was, that when the number of those members diminished, the Union had to look to the first source of revenue. These were facts which it would have been hardly dignified to publish officially, but the instinct of the Church party ought to have made their publication unnecessary. Unfortunately, however, the recollection of 1850 made the more quiet years that followed dull by contrast; and the partizan instinct which ought to have taught Churchmen that it was worth while to pay a little in time of peace in order that when war came the defences might be serviceable, was somewhat lacking. Men who, we believe, would have been ready to go to the stake, or to have been torn by wild horses, in defence of the faith, did not see the need of, and neglected paying a trifling subscription to maintain the London Union in a condition to meet a sudden emergency.

Nevertheless, in face of such discouragement and apathy, the Committee of the Union did not throw up the cards in despair. Had it been better backed it might, as it is needless to remark, have done more efficient service; but what the service was that, standing single handed, it did effect for the Church cause, may be judged of by a few instances. Our readers may possibly recollect that a few years since a scheme was started by a fussy London Incumbent, Mr. C. Hume, and was backed unhappily by the late Bishop, for a demolition of churches both reckless and sacrilegious, in the City of London and some other populous towns, which came before Parliament in the shape of a bill introduced by Lord Harrowby. It will not be forgotten that the opposition to this measure was inaugurated by a public meeting of influential City notables, and that although the measure was not immediately dropped by its promoters, at last the idea was taken up by other heads, and finally assumed the shape of that report from a Committee of Sion College upon the Union of City parishes, which was drawn up last year during the presidency of Mr. W. Scott. The original opposition to the measure, it may not be so generally known, was planned in the committee-room of the London Union.

To proceed to events of still deeper interest, we conclude that no Churchman will deny that of all the cases (since the Gorham one) in which Church interests have been at stake before Courts of Law, the most important have been the Denison case, in which, to look at only one of its phases, the attempt was made to confine the interpretation of the articles within the liberty allowed by the Church of England, and indeed (*vide* Bishop Guest's letter) within the very intention of their framers, and that of the Belgravian churches, in which the attempt was made to cut the ritual of the Church down to a Puritan standard. In both these cases, the defence was provided from the Committee of the Union. The Denison Defence Fund was arranged in its Committee-room, although it was thought expedient not to mix up the name of a private association with a great Church cause. Again, when the suit between Mr. Liddell and Mr. Westerton became a public and not a parochial dispute, the Committee of the Union came forward, and, with the hearty approbation of the incumbent, appointed a sub-committee of its body, which thenceforward took a leading part in conducting the affair until the very day of the judgment in the Privy Council. In none of these matters, it will be seen, did the London Union obtrude its name. If it had done so, it might have earned more popular reputation, but it is doubtful whether it would have so efficiently helped the Church cause, and so it preferred the interests of that cause to its own ephemeral popularity. It may be said that the charge against it is not that of having done nothing, but of not having done enough—we answer that there is no question that it did not do as much as might under other circumstances have been done, but that the blame of this deficiency lies upon the Church party which allowed it to languish, and not upon its executive, which continued year after year to work with steadfast determination, and, as we have seen, to do so much.

It is now nearly three years since the Committee of the Union determined to make a vigorous effort to reinstate the Society in the position of leadership, which it had done nothing to forfeit, and so much to deserve. Public meetings were held, the Committee assembled in unusual numbers and greater frequency, and at the moment of the resuscitation the divorce bill was engaging the anxious thoughts of Churchmen. Pre-engaged by other hands as the leading opposition to the measure was, the Committee was yet enabled to render signal, though unproclaimed, assistance to the good work. Later in the year the Committee was again enabled to render valuable service to the Church cause, and by not parading its name to have again the satisfaction of effecting a work, without tarnishing its merit

by any breath of popularity-hunting. We quote from the annual report of December 8, 1858 :

‘The last annual meeting was held on the eve of a short autumnal session of Parliament. Use was adroitly made of this brief interval by Lord Shaftesbury to introduce into the House of Lords a bill calculated seriously to affect the parochial system, the pretext for which was found in the suspension of the Exeter Hall services by the act of the incumbent of the district in which that building stands. Churchmen are generally aware that the noble lord was induced to withdraw his bill in favour of one of a different character introduced by the Archbishop of Canterbury, as the representative of the Episcopal Bench. Your Committee has now no difficulty in stating that its exertions were not wanting to the negotiations which led to the framing of this measure. The bill passed the Upper House with amendments which it is not now necessary to discuss, but it was withdrawn in the House of Commons, and so the formal law remains as it was before. But in the interval the question of missionary preaching in distinction to parochial services has taken, through the indirect agency of that agitation, a very different attitude from what it had previously assumed, owing to the opening about a year since of the nave of Westminster Abbey, and, within the last ten days, of that of S. Paul’s, for Sunday evening sermons, accompanied by the full choral service. These movements are, as they profess to be, experimental. But they are experiments in the right direction, and the energy with which the two Capitular bodies took up, and popular sympathy seconded, them, is a healthy sign of life in our Church.’

The principal Parliamentary question during the remaining session of 1858, about which the Committee felt that it could exercise a useful influence, was that of the bill for legalizing marriage with a deceased wife’s sister, then for the first time introduced by Lord Bury, after it had successively passed through the hands of Lord Francis Egerton, Mr. Wortley, Mr. Heywood, and Lord St. Germans. What the Committee did was to send into every parish of England and Ireland, some 14,000 in number, a copy of a petition against the bill to both Houses of the Legislature, with the fullest directions as to their preparation and presentation, and a list of members of Parliament prepared to take charge of them, including names of such standing in the House of Commons, that within a fortnight after the issue of the paper, three of them had become Cabinet ministers, and a fourth had to give up his seat on becoming Lord Chancellor of Ireland. We need hardly say that this was neither an inexpensive nor an easy work, and the result was that less than 300 petitions were returned in reply to the circular, upon which, according to the usual course of the Committee, its name did not appear, in order that the cause in hand might not be affected by any party consideration. The petitions came amply recommended by the names of the eminent senators, who were willing to take charge of them. If, then, there is a slackening of zeal, it is not to be traced to the apathy of the London Union. The state of the Church-rate question

and the organizations already in existence about it, precluded the Union Committee from taking up an individual policy as to the rate; but the annual report gave evidence that the subject had not escaped its attention. As the year moved on, the Poole and Boyn-hill cases re-opened the controversy, always delicate and undesirable, upon confession. How the Union Committee acted in regard to Mr. Poole is best explained by another extract from the Report:

‘Your Committee, at an early period of the affair, took into consideration the case of the Rev. A. Poole. As, however, it appeared upon investigation that he had wisely placed his case in the hands of legal advisers of undoubted eminence, your Committee felt that, alike in justice to those advisers, and out of regard to Mr. Poole’s own interest, it could only express its confidence in them, and its recommendation to the inculcated clergyman to continue in his reliance on their advice. The recent proceedings in the Court of Queen’s Bench prove the wisdom of the course pursued. The somewhat analogous Boyn-hill inquiry happily did not admit of any intervention on the part of your Committee, which has only to congratulate the Union upon the result of that proceeding.’

Incredible as it may seem, the course which the Committee pursued with respect to Mr. Poole—a course in which his incumbent, Mr. Liddell, concurred, and which he took occasion publicly to vindicate—brought down upon the Union a stream of invective, as if it had betrayed the cause of the Church by its prudent proceedings. That there should have been Churchmen so blind to the spirit of the times as to have desired public demonstrations and indignation meetings in behalf of confession, was sufficiently startling; but that they should make it a cause of complaint against the Committee of the London Union that they had not indulged this desire, is almost passing belief. No doubt by so doing they might have reaped a little temporary and noisy popularity in some quarters—but at what a risk to the whole Church cause! Anyhow, the existence of such a feeling is in itself sufficient proof of the need of a Church executive able and willing to act as the drag-chain, no less than the goad.

We have said enough to show that during 1858 the London Union was not idle. We cannot report similar activity during 1859. We have no desire to exaggerate, and so we must honestly confess that it has done very little during the past year. The reason of this inertness is no secret. Churchmen could not be persuaded of the desirability of renewing and maintaining their organization as a party. The appeal had been fairly made to them in 1857 and 1858, and they had not responded to it. Willing accordingly as the most active members of the Committee, men who have been eleven years in its harness, were and are to do their utmost for the cause and the

party, they felt that they could not be always working against a dead weight of apathy, and so we believe they are now taking a breathing-time to see whether there are any signs of a revived interest in that carefully framed organization for the Church's benefit, which has for so many years existed, and has in the opinion of its working members done much to deserve the continued confidence of Churchmen.

To turn to a more cheering prospect, the continuous success of Churchmen at all the elections for Convocation, since it became again a speaking body, in 1852, 1857, and 1859, shows how strong the position is of the Church cause throughout the country. No one, of course, can tell how much more might have been done, if those who have that cause at heart would have worked together and in concert. All praise is due to the Convocation Society for what it has done towards raising and maintaining a popular feeling in behalf of synodical action. The indefatigable labours of love of Mr. H. Hoare, on behalf of this great end, have been and are perfectly herculean. But Mr. Hoare's zeal has not been satisfied by the mere revival of Convocation; though no doubt at first he confined himself to this important work. But as time went on, the necessity of local exertions throughout the Church made itself more and more apparent; above all the need of engaging the laity in some deliberative action was one that could not any longer be blinked, and by great good fortune Mr. Hoare succeeded in striking out a scheme, which, while it avoided raising the fears of the soliclerical section, satisfied for the time being the wishes of the pro-lay party, with the honest avowal that they should not for the future be bound to regard the settlement as an ultimatum. The plan is best described in a memorial to the dignitaries of the Church, drawn up by Mr. Hoare rather more than a year since, and adopted at a public meeting held in York:—

'1. That the clergy of this realm should be permitted to meet in their respective Convocations, as by law established.

'2. That the judicial character of Episcopal and other Visitations, as by law established, should be maintained.

'3. That where meetings of the clergy in rural deaneries are now held, they should continue to be held; and that where they are not now held, they should be set on foot, subject to the approval of the Ordinary; uniformity of practice, in every respect, being desirable in all the dioceses of England and Wales.

'4. That in the same divisions of dioceses, or in such others as may be more convenient to the Archdeacons and Rural Deans, the clergy of the locality should occasionally form themselves into consulting committees, at whose meetings certain of the laity from neighbouring parishes should be requested to give their attendance, for the purpose of common advice and mutual consultation on matters which, from time to time, the clergy may deem of sufficient importance to require the joint cognisance and consideration of the whole Church.

'5. That an association should be formed, as far as may be practicable and convenient, in every parish, for the promotion of objects calculated to create an extended interest and sympathy in behalf of the Church, such associations being invariably under the superintendence or control of the incumbent, or of the officiating minister, and the subjects selected for consideration being sanctioned by him.'

The organization sketched out in these suggestions has not been left to bloom on paper only. It had already been experimentally tried in more than one rural deanery, and during the last twelvemonth the experiment has been inaugurated in London upon an extensive scale. No doubt if it should ramify over all England, and if, in its management, zeal and discretion should be found to go hand in hand, a very powerful machinery will have been set at work in behalf of our Church as at present constituted. Why, then, we fancy we hear some one ask, lament the decay of the Church Unions, when an institution so much more systematic seems to be taking their place? We reply that, admitting its force of system and its power, we cannot agree that it takes the place of the Church Unions. This is precisely the one thing which it does not do. It is most admirable as an institution parallel to them (existing or non-existing), and as such we hail it, and desire to promote it to the utmost of our influence; but if Euclid speaks aright, parallel lines never meet. The essence of Mr. Hoare's 'Lay Consultee'—of which the worst feature is this horrid neologism—movement is that of treating the actual Church of England as one whole, and ignoring the existence of a 'High' and a 'Low' party. A society which can honestly carry out such a policy is of incontestable benefit. In the Established Church there must, short of a convulsion—which we at least have no desire to precipitate—be, for many years to come, representatives of the High and of the Low Church party; and co-existing as they do in the same establishment, there are many questions connected with that Church in which they have a common interest to unite against antagonists, whether dissenters outside the Church's fold, or cold and nominal adherents within it,—the question of Church-rates for example. Besides, in a moral point of view it is very advantageous for the Church cause to give its leading members the opportunity of meeting the leading members of the other side in friendly consultation, and of proving to them that to be a High Churchman does not involve being an antedated stake-and-faggot persecutor. Opportunities of joint consultation, without compromise of principle within the pale of the Church, are in themselves means of unmixed good. But when we have acknowledged all this, we have placed the case for the simultaneous retention of Church Unions in all the

stronger light. These bodies exist not on the principle of ignoring the existing parties in the actual Church of 1860; but on that of ignoring the possibility of a vital divergence of doctrine and discipline in the Church of the English Reformation. Divergences on minor points are cheerfully admitted, but the *sine quâ non* of belonging to a Church Union is to be what some would call a 'high,' and others a genuine Churchman—a Churchman, that is to say, whose terms of communion are the devotional and symbolical writings of the Church of England literally interpreted. No doubt there are diversities of opinion among themselves as to what constitutes a High Churchman, and as undoubtedly there is a very broad *differentia* between any High and any Low Churchman, and it is this *differentia* which forms the limit of membership in a Church Union, and which does not exist in the 'lay consultee' association. For example, not to touch upon any question of direct doctrine, had the 'lay consultees' been in force throughout England, and the Church Unions extinct, the case of *Liddell v. Westerton* might have fared differently; for, according to the informing spirit of Mr. Hoare's movement, it would have been the duty of those who had its success at heart, to refrain from breaking ground upon any topic which would bring into prominence the antagonistic co-existence of a Catholic and of a Puritan element in our Church. We need not multiply instances to prove our thesis: that, most valuable as the lay consultee movement is, it does not supply the place of the Church Union organization to the Church party.

We have now reached the present day in our very imperfect sketch of the fortunes of the Church party, and we have shown how the natural growth of the great revival of Church principles developed a body of men anxious and able to combine their own and their fellow Churchmen's exertions in some general organization for the benefit of the common cause. We have pointed out how, on various occasions, this organized party obtained successes, brilliant, indeed, but never quite complete even in the partizan object of moulding into one united policy the various sections who had, with whatever minor differences, the one great object of the Church cause at heart. We have indicated how the 23d of July seemed, for the moment, to have made this possible, and what unexpected events so soon introduced confusion into the Church's ranks. Finally, we have not scrupled to own and to regret that at this moment the 'party' is, we will not say, extinct—for this we are fully persuaded it is not—but in a state of suspended animation. We shall now turn our attention from the Church party towards the Church cause, and show how much we have to be thankful for in the progress

which, by the Divine blessing, as we humbly and fully believe, it has been making even in those years during which, had it not been a movement from above, it must have fallen into decay from the absence of any combined understanding amongst those persons who were severally devoting themselves, each in his own circle, to work out the Church revival.

Among the more favourable characteristics of later years we shall, in the first place, notice the extinction of those causes of difference which, in earlier days, separated the 'new' from the 'old' school of High Churchmen. No doubt the individual differences in zeal and in knowledge are almost as numerous as the clergy themselves, but still they are emphatically personal differences. The regular so-called 'high and dry' party—the clergy who, like the estimable Mr. Irwine, so imitably described in Adam Bede, cared more for the ceremony than for the doctrine of Baptism,—may still exist in isolated instances; but the class has gone as a party, and there is no clergyman owning to be 'High,' who does not acknowledge with more or less of fervour, how much the Church is indebted to the movement of 1833. Several causes have concurred to this result. The inevitable course of nature in so many years, which has called away those who were the most old-fashioned—because the oldest—must undoubtedly be reckoned in the first place. But those that are left have as undoubtedly advanced with their times, and hold and practise much that would have amazed them five-and-twenty, or even twenty years ago. On the other hand, those whose professions of adherence to the new school were then tinged with the fervour of youth, have now learned to state the same facts in language more akin to the ordinary vernacular, and so win a due attention. There is many a clergyman who, at thirty-five or forty years of age, may have been either distressed or scandalized at the bold, semi-petulant assertions of the brisk collegian, who now finds himself, at the age of some fifty-five, in confidential counsel, at local committee or ruridecanal chapter, with that same collegian, grown up into a staid incumbent, on matters of mutual interest, with a perfect agreement between themselves upon the common ground of an intelligent apprehension of the system, disciplinary, ritual, and doctrinal, of the Prayer-book. We repeat that we are not so utopian as to believe, or so dishonest as to profess, that all or even the majority of the *ci-devant* 'old' party has as yet grasped the Anglo-Catholic system with the same logical completeness as the younger generation who have grown up in the study of that system as embodied in the writings of the Oxford and Cambridge leaders of the movement, and in the now common reprints of our seventeenth century divines. But they are no longer in

any antagonism to the revival of a Churchmanship beyond their own previous ideal. They worship preferentially, when in London, at churches where the Church system is best exhibited; they adopt in their own restorations or new churches (which are every day becoming more numerous) features which would have frightened them out of their proprieties when first enunciated by the 'Camden Society.' They subscribe to the right societies, they vote for the right men to Convocation, they support most warmly those colonial missions in which the Church system is exhibited with the greatest and most uncompromising fervour: in one word, they are engaged heartily in the Church 'cause' in all its external manifestations. If in their doctrinal acuteness, or in their appreciation of the organization of the Christian Church as a sacramental, even more than a disciplinary system, many of them may be more or less vague, it is the part of wisdom and charity to make the best of such shortcomings, which are but natural under the special circumstances of the revival.

The marvellous circumstance is, not that the traces of the easy-going 'old' view of Churchmanship should still be visible, but that they should have so rapidly and so generally given place to better and higher appreciations. As with the clergy, so is it with the laity, though of course the transmutation is slower and more irregular in their case; but then likewise we venture to assert that, with the visible exhibitions of the Church system more frequently and more fearlessly held up to them, so has the standard of the laity been imperceptibly raised even in that generation to whom, educated as they were in the more careless and irreverential system, amelioration wears the aspect of innovation. But with the laity the real experiment has yet to be tried. We cannot too often or too forcibly proclaim, that until that generation which was suckled in Church principles from the breast, which has been accustomed to Church ways, Church seasons, solemn services, as the rule and not the exception of their earliest life, becomes not merely adults, but themselves the parents and the instructors of a later generation already growing into intelligent perception; the true vitality, the genuine inrootedness of the Church revival cannot be adequately tested. Each year, as it concludes, brings this crucial season nearer; but it has not yet arrived. The second generation is indeed now stepping on the scene, but the third has hardly yet arisen to prove their parents' sincerity.

It has we know sometimes been said that the 'high' Church fashion has had its day, and that now the 'Broad Church' success is setting in. We entirely demur to this doctrine, for this simple reason, that, although we know of many estimable clergymen

and laymen who are styled Broad Churchmen, we have never yet been fortunate enough to discover a corporate coherence which is to secure success for the Broad Church, either as a party or a doctrinal cause. It will be remembered that the name suddenly sprung up into full-grown currency through that article, more smart than deep, on Church parties, by the late Mr. Conybeare, which appeared a few years since in the *Edinburgh Review*. 'Broad Church' had a ringing sound, and made up the trio cleverly with High and Low, and it accordingly graduated in the language with a rapidity only equalled by that which led the universal public some years before to connect a one-horse chariot with a famous ex-chancellor. In the meanwhile, however, the members of the Broad Church party were gazetted without their leave being asked for, or even thought of. Few indeed protested, if any, and so the new party came into existence on paper, with ranks formidable for the numbers and the ability of the names upon its roster. But if their opinions come to be tested, the infinite variety which at once becomes apparent, shows how impossible it is for the Broad Church ever to become either a cause or a party. To take the latest example, Mr. Maurice's indignation at Mr. Kingsley's supposed obligations to him is eminently suggestive. The High Church cause combines the different sections of its followers in the belief of an apostolic ministry and sacramental grace. Low Churchmen have their Shibboleths. But the definition of a Broad Churchman as such is merely the negative one, that he does not choose to be called either High or Low. There are persons using the name who consider 'Church' as merely an expletive, and in whose eyes 'Broad' is pretty well synonymous with indistinct and undefined,—'Christians unattached,' in short, who have not openly left the Establishment. But it is most unjust to impute this character to Broad Churchmen as a class, for we are convinced that under that vocable are included many men really zealous for the Church cause, and for the *bene esse* of the actual Prayer-book Church, but to whom the name and idea of party, in connexion with religious affairs, is peculiarly offensive, and who accordingly take refuge in an appellation which they consider has come into existence as a protest against the High and the Low Church parties. To such as these we gladly bid 'God speed,' and from their co-operation, whatever be its degree, more or less hearty, more or less complete, we anticipate great good for the cause, which might perhaps have continued unattainable, had they not found a name under which they could work for that cause, without identifying themselves with that Church party in which, from however unfounded suspicions, they were unwilling to enlist. But we shall be asked why we anticipate the possibility of any

special co-operation from the so-called Broad Churchmen, rather than from members of the Low Church party—since, it will be said, you have hoisted the banner of the Church cause, you find yourself in harmony with influential sections of that organization upon many questions on which you and they think alike, and, thinking alike, think diversely from the latitudinarian section of the Broad Church? We grant the latter part of this observation to the uttermost, but we reply, that there is a direct and intentional opposition between the adjectives ‘High’ and ‘Low,’ which does not exist between High and Broad, and that in this opposition consists the difference.

A Broad Churchman may be to any extent neutral or indifferent about what is of the most vital interest to the High Churchman; but he is not necessarily antagonistic; a Low Churchman is *vi termini* an antagonist, in so far as he is Low; and upon the matters in which the distinction between High and Low comes out. Besides, the ‘High’ Churchman only accepts his adjective under a protest, and out of deference to the general weakness. He holds himself to be, and desires others to consider him, *simpliciter* a Churchman. If words have any value, the prefix ‘Low’ applied to Church has a depreciatory value, and so the person who is *simpliciter* a Churchman, can never be actually one with the man who refuses to be a Churchman, except with a depreciatory prefix. It may, indeed, be almost admitted that

‘High Church and Low Church
Is A Church and No Church.’

There is, however, nothing depreciatory in the prefix ‘Broad,’ nor anything to derogate from the possibility of the man who uses it claiming at another time to be *simpliciter* a Churchman, in a full and genuine acceptance of the term. Neither High nor Broad are of Scriptural authority, and if it had happened, a thing not impossible, that the Puritan party, from its Calvinistic affinities, had taken the name of ‘narrow’ instead of ‘low’ Church, its orthodox opponents would have been termed broad instead of high Churchmen, many generations before the former word actually came into vogue. It is hardly necessary for us to say that we are no apologists for the vagueness of opinion with which many Broad Churchmen, even of the better sort, may be justly charged on matters of importance. We are taking the Church of England as it stands, and while we admit and deplore that vagueness, we may be allowed to believe that in so far as it is not hostile to the precise faith, it is more hopeful and more truthful than the rigid narrow anti-Catholic bigotry which is so often the normal character of the Low Churchman. ‘I hesitate’ may not be a comfortable frame of

mind, but it is many degrees better than, 'I repudiate'—for the Gospel, according to Exeter Hall, may be definite enough when it is most opposed to the Gospel, according to Apostles and Evangelists; and it is, therefore, only reasonable and right to hold out the hand to those who have attained the knowledge of this contrariety, and so assist them towards the firm footing of the ancient faith. Sabbatarianism, psilo-biblistism, Solifidianism, contempt for the beautiful in service and in fabric, that study of apocalyptic prophecy, which is perpetually calling, 'Lo here, or lo there,' the undervaluing of the critical study of the original text, and the unconscious substitution of Milton's irreverent figments for the awful and reticent statements of inspiration, are all phases of popular religious error, in opposing which, the Church cause may, without fear or reproach, accept the aid of earnest and reverential broad Churchmen. If these inventions of the anti-sacramental system are once swept away, the bias of positive religion must, humanly speaking, tend towards the faith of the ancient universal Church. As an incidental illustration of the standing of the better portion of the 'broad Church' towards the Church cause, we need not go further than the meeting held at Shrewsbury this autumn, for the unsuccessful purpose of bullying a clergyman who had made some very moderate and cautious ameliorations in his service. At this gathering, the chief defender of the clergyman was found in the person of the learned, able, and high-minded Dr. Kennedy, who, in a speech of noticeable power and honesty, confessed, as a Broad Churchman, no little sympathy with the persecuted clergyman against his Puritan opponents, and gave, as his own opinion, that the 'moderate high Churchmen' were the largest party in the Church of England.

As to the question of comparative numbers, no better test can be applied than the prevalent hue of the Churchmanship of the elective members of Convocation. It might have been speciously urged, that at the general election of 1852, the first really contested election of a real Convocation for nearly a century and a half, the low Church party were caught napping, and in their incredulity as to Convocation ever recovering its voice, allowed their opponents to win the easy guerdon of many sham successes. But when, at the elections of 1857 and of 1859, the high Church majority was steadily maintained in the face of violent exertions on the part of its opponents, the conviction irresistibly grew that the largest number of the clergy of England were high Church, while the further fact, that very few, if any, professed broad Church candidates presented themselves as such, was an evidence that there was, properly speaking, no broad 'party' in action, but that the clergy who called themselves by

that vocable, took the opportunity of protesting against Puritan bigotry by their support of the Church candidates.

We are fully alive to the negative character of the next point, which we propose to pass in favourable review. But the absence of a great disadvantage may, by comparison, be reckoned as a decided advantage. The most damaging feature of the Church revival has unquestionably been that of the secessions to Rome, which, although not more numerous than to be able (as the *Times* with cynical truthfulness lately said) nearly to fill a moderately sized room, have yet periodically aroused the national timidity and suspiciousness to an extent which it would be foolish to depreciate. These secessions were, we grant, very startling. We were startled by them as much as any one else, even the *Record*. But they were the result of causes easy to be explained to those who chose to listen, and in reality they in no way invalidated the genuineness of the Church movement. It was but natural that in a movement from too little to sufficient Church, several people should be unable to put on the break at the right moment, and so should pass on to too much; but the noticeable feature of the Romeward secessions was that all or nearly all of those who were most prominent in their abandonment of High Churchmanship, had earlier in life been prominent for their zeal in the Low Church interest; while of those who had passed into genuine Churchmanship from the old established, or 'high and dry' parties, or from simple indifference, few, if any, were seduced across the boundary.

In confirmation of this assertion we may repeat the observation, that the principal secessions group themselves under two epochs. First is the Newman epoch, comprising in its numbers seceders whose faith had been weakened ever since 1839. The desertion of those persons was ostensibly caused, as we have shown above, by the circumstances in connexion with the Jerusalem Bishopric, Tract 90, and the Ward and Oakeley affairs. The most prominent seceders of this epoch were Messrs. *Newman, Ward, Oakeley, Dalgairns, Faber*, of whom we have italicised all who were originally prominent as Low Churchmen. The second epoch may be denominated the Manning one, and comprehends the seceders who left the Church of England subsequently to the Gorham case and at the time of the Papal aggression. It includes (Low Churchmen being similarly marked) Messrs. *Manning, Dodsworth, R. Wilberforce, H. Wilberforce, Hope-Scott, Allies, and Maskell*. Impressible as the popular mind is by facts, rather than by the reason of those facts, it is not surprising that the public refused to listen to reason on this head, and that the Church cause accordingly suffered heavily by these deplorable events, while every fresh

secession which may occur tends to keep alive the irritation. But we see nothing at present foreboding a movement towards Rome on the part of any section of Churchmen possessing anything like the weight of the Newman or the Manning clique. As to those who occasionally drop off, they go out on their own responsibility, while their act no more invalidates the soundness of our position than the individual aberration of any person injures any cause with which he may be identified.

We say this with the full consciousness of the existence, during the last three years, of a weekly journal, professing Church principles of a strong, not to say extreme tendency, whose intemperate language in denunciation of persons and things in the Church of England, and in praise of the Roman system, has created a very deep feeling of dissatisfaction in those who are most keenly alive to the errors of popular religionism, and most anxious to raise our Church out of their influence. The grounds upon which the paper in question was established were in themselves colourable. It was argued that the excellent journal which has established itself as the organ of Churchmanship sometimes took a politic rather than a theological view of questions, and was occasionally apt to criticise where it ought rather to sympathise. Of course the answer to the first of these reasonings was that theology and journalism did not go well together, and that if an organ of a somewhat technical and *ad clerum* character were needed, it ought to be in a more pamphlet-like form than a weekly paper. As to the second head of the count, even were it occasionally well founded, yet the establishment of a rival sheet was not the most effective remedial process. Still, of the mere fact of a new journal in the interests of the Church cause being set up, nothing worse could be predicated than that its projectors judged unwisely in a worldly point of view. The sudden summersault by which a weekly paper, notorious for its rabid animosity to good Churchmanship, became, by a mere change of heading, the advocate of the High Church cause in its most extreme aspects, might fairly awaken alarms which would not otherwise have existed. Still, the candidate was on its trial, and it was open to it to have disarmed the apprehensions of Churchmen by its ability, wisdom, and moderation. Let those who have ever looked into its pages answer whether the result has been of this favourable character. Much, no doubt, that it says, is what we may agree with in matter, though not always in manner; but there is much about which, both as to matter and manner, we deeply regret, alike for the writers and the readers of the paper, that it should ever have been allowed to see the light. Had its most startling diatribes or most disturbing investigations been graced either

with originality of thought or vigour of language, we should have, while not the less lamenting the existence of so damaging an advocate of the Church cause, have owned its claims upon the respectful consideration of the polemical world. But when, week after week, we are satiated with a cold hash-up of the opinions of the later British critics, the apologists for Tract 90, the biographers of the 'British Saints,' and the idealist of the Christian Church, in language weakly flatulent and forcibly feeble, without one scintilla of the wit, the picturesqueness, and the logic of the able men who had in their days possessed the unhappy privilege of disorganizing the Church party and damping the Church cause, we can only pray that the conductors of the paper may as speedily as possible be brought to the conviction that the best service they can render to the Church is to disband their corps, and leave the *ci-devant Church and State Gazette* to decessate from natural decay of forces. But if they continue to make the Vestment question the *articulus stantis vel cadentis Ecclesiæ*, to identify its success or failure with that of sacramental doctrine itself, to reiterate their flippant and irreverent vocabulary of slang, 'table prayers,' and so forth, to endeavour to re-open the breach between 'old' and 'new' High Churchmen, and to prop their arguments with stories as preposterous as that which on one occasion headed the principal leading article,—of an old woman of the past generation, who was in the habit of attending early morning prayers at York Minster, and who, happening one day to go rather earlier than usual, was rewarded by the vision of some future restoration of all the elaborate pomp of mediæval worship, about which she knew as much as the verger,—we shall be compelled more strongly and more emphatically than we do at present to call upon Churchmen to repudiate an organ so thoroughly puerile and detrimental.¹

¹ We may be allowed to refer to a particular instance of the *Union's* polemics in regard to an individual. Mr. Beresford Hope, who was a candidate for the University of Cambridge in the early part of last year, received a letter from one of his supporters, the Rev. E. Perowne, relative to his connexion with the ritualism of All Saints' Church, Margaret Street. Mr. Beresford Hope, in his reply, briefly repudiated any connexion with that particular ritualism, and—stating that he had never been inside the then temporary church (which he forgot to explain had been used since 1854) from the dissatisfaction which he had felt with the ritualism employed in its predecessors—informed his correspondent that his connexion with the new church of All Saints' was 'purely architectural,' and that, desirous as he was to see 'art in its noblest and purest forms adapted to the worship of the Most High,' he yet disapproved of the system of 'minute observances' which had grown into use in 'that locality,' (i.e. the successive temporary chapels as far as he was acquainted with them,) to which he applied the term 'Romanist' apparently in reference to its minuteness, and not to any grandeur or artistic beauty which they possessed, as was proved by his expressed wish, to render such ultra-ritualism in the new church 'as impossible' as he could, while

Still we do not compliment the paper, written in though it be, and belauded by Romanists, by any fear that it betokens a revival of the days of 1845, or of 1851. As we have said, stragglers will continue to drop off, but we trust and hope that the mass (if mass there be) of those who approve of that paper's polemics, will be no more dazzled by its puny scintillations than they were by the mightier blaze of a Newman's logic or a Manning's rhetoric. There is many a man who in the fervour of his youth used to boast that he would stop in the Church of England as long as, but no longer than Mr. Newman or Archdeacon Manning, who is now by divine grace cheerfully and hopefully labouring in its vineyard. We trust and we believe the same of the readers of that unfortunate ephemeral.

Quorsum hæc? We have been dwelling upon considerations external to the *causa causalis* of the Church 'cause.' Why is it a 'cause?'—what has it caused? We are prepared to answer this most reasonable interrogatory. The Church cause exists, not to create the Catholic faith, *quod semper quod ubique quod ab omnibus est creditum*, but to produce in the Anglican communion, which it acknowledges as belonging to the unity of that Catholic Faith, the fruit worthy of such a tree. Upon the doctrinal growth, and the wounds which that growth has received in the house of friends, we are not willing to dilate. We believe that the damage incident on an individual doctrinal defeat may sometimes be less detrimental to the immediate well-being of

striving after 'architectural and artistic beauty,'—how!—'by the simplicity and dignity of the arrangements.' We are not now concerned to investigate how far Mr. Beresford Hope was justified in his unfavourable judgment of the 'ultra-ritualism' employed in 'that locality.' The *Union* had a perfect right, if it pleased, to contest that point; but we conclude he spoke the truth when he said that he had never been inside the last temporary chapel, and therefore, that (a natural *sequitur* surely) his connexion with the particular church of All Saints' was 'purely architectural,' and that he had 'never identified' himself with the 'system,' explaining as he further did, that 'the splendid munificence of friends' had 'entrusted to him the administration of their gifts,' thus manifestly depriving him of any option of retiring from the work, whether or not he could still follow it up with perfect confidence in its successful results, other than artistic. He said absolutely nothing, one way or the other, for he was asked nothing, about his general views on ritualism, except what might be inferentially but reasonably gleaned from the sentences, speaking in reference to the new church, of 'art in its noblest and purest forms adapted to the worship of the Most High,' 'artistic model,' 'architectural and artistic beauty,' and 'simplicity and dignity of arrangements.' What interpretation, however, has the *Union*, sometimes in its editorial columns, sometimes in the correspondence which it admits, persistently affixed to this letter? The flagrantly unfair and unfounded one, that Mr. Beresford Hope repudiated his known taste for ecclesiology, and condescended to pretend that all he had anywhere done in its behalf was simply for the gratification of an architectural *penchant*; and that (for the *Union* does not scruple to make this further insinuation) with this pretended repudiation of ecclesiology, Mr. Beresford Hope confessed himself unfaithful to the Church cause in doctrine as well as in ritual. We leave to our readers to say whether such misrepresentations are within the limits of fair polemics.

the cause than one upon a matter of secondary import in its dogmatic signification. The latter generally alters or deteriorates something materially existing, and is, in proportion to that alteration or deterioration, materially obnoxious. The action of the former during the abeyance of any collective voice, legislative or judicial, of the Anglican communion competent to speak *ex cathedra*, must be more or less personal and extra-material in its action, and therefore admits of being virtually minimised in proportion as it is accepted partially and with a bad grace—while, at the worst, it merely adds a chapter to that record of trials which exists to try and to prove the practical faith of English Churchmen. The Gorham judgment insulted their holiest feelings, and they let the depth of the insult be known. The result is that the intelligent comprehension of the doctrine of Baptismal Regeneration, and the conviction that the Prayer-book teaches that doctrine and nothing else, is probably far stronger at this day than it was ten years ago. This, we believe, will prove to be the result of controversies, greatly as their agitation is to be deplored and deprecated, upon the doctrine of the Eucharist. On the contrary, disputes upon secondary questions may often result in the *main forte* being then and there summarily laid upon something which it might be very desirable to preserve, without any compensating advantage in return for the privation.

Practically, the signs of hope and vitality among us are both numerous and weighty. The extension of the colonial Church, its bishoprics where presbyterates barely existed a few years since, its synods of clergy and laity joined in harmonious concert, its cathedrals replacing proprietary chapels, its colleges rising in every direction, its missions to the heathen, ending with the hopeful Central African one, with which the Senate-House of Cambridge so lately rang, would require pages upon pages to exhaust their significance. Suffice it to say, that in the colonies that lie between the eastern shores of Labrador and Newfoundland and the mouth of the Columbia river, in the West Indian groups, in the great new world of civilization growing into being in South Africa, in the almost continent of Australia and the large islands of Tasmania and New Zealand, in the Polynesian and Melanesian groups,—in India, too, to a more partial extent,—and finally, in that vigorous ‘Protestant Episcopal’ community, which, existing as it does in the numerous States of the American Union, presents so many points of resemblance to our own colonial Church—we see growing into shape, with features in the main distinctly Church-like, a vast and energetic development of religious life, founded in the doctrines of Episcopacy, and on the sacramental system of the

English Prayer-book—a development of which the first seeds were sown in the very lifetime of the fathers and the mothers of those who are still in active middle life.¹

We have already dwelt upon the Church form of the instinct for collective self-government, now rife among us, and we pass on to the actual manifestations of vigour apparent in the educational and the devotional phases of the Church of England. The old universities will not detain us long. We believe that, substantially, the Church cause will be found to be holding its ground in both of them, although the first excitement and fervour of the movement having passed away, the Church party does not fill so conspicuous a space in the eye of the critical by-stander.² The triumph of the Church cause, shown in education, is to be mainly sought, as far as the higher and middle classes are concerned, in the improvement of our ancient public schools, and in the numerous new institutions of a collegiate character springing up on every side. If Eton be compared to what it was in the days of George III., we venture to say that the revolution of a century crammed into less than half that space, would be a faint description of the change. Harrow under Dr. Wordsworth reared its chapel: under Dr. Vaughan that chapel, sumptuously rebuilt, exhibits to successive generations of pupils a noble specimen of the beauty of holiness in the English Church. But why take our public schools one by one? Each would furnish some pregnant example of our proposition, and the fact that the first great reformer of the Anglican public schools was the man who perhaps gave utterance to the most gravely severe words ever employed against the rising Church party, Dr. Arnold, proves how much the Church cause may draw succour from every soil through which the healthy rain of heaven percolates. The new collegiate creations of the last twenty years are a living monument of the zeal of one generation. Although its establishment dates a little before the date we have selected, Durham University deserves first notice. Diocesan colleges, as at Wells, Chichester, Cuddesdon, Lichfield, are a class of institutions previously unknown, and the missionary abbey of England, restored as its missionary college, should not be forgotten. S. Peter's, Radley, and its model, S. Columba's, in Ireland, and Trinity College, Perthshire, are whole-hearted

¹ Dr. Routh was one of those who advised Bishop Seabury to seek consecration in Scotland, and Bishop White, whose consecration at Lambeth so soon followed Seabury's courageous plunge, died only two years before the accession of the Queen.

² The cheer with which the undergraduates welcomed the Bishop of Oxford's fearless enunciation of the Apostolical Succession at the Cambridge meeting, was noticed by many persons as a remarkable proof of the present strength of the Church cause.

endeavours to create new Church-like and public schools upon the old models reformed; and of a larger scope than either, Mr. Woodard's vast scheme of public schools, to embrace within the Church system, and under one administration, all classes of society in all quarters of the kingdom, has made a splendid commencement in its 'upper-middle' class college of S. John at Hurstpierpoint and its gentle college of S. Nicolas at Lancing; while a third college, for the 'lower-middle' class, is already on foot at Shoreham; in another part of the same county of Sussex, and under cognate influence, collegiate education for girls is being attempted at S. Michael's House, Bognor. S. Andrew's College, at Bradfield, is a worthy rival to Radley, and S. Michael's College, Tenbury, cannot be unnoticed. The Clergy Orphan School has, with its removal to Canterbury, assumed a collegiate character. Such institutions as the New Medical Benevolent College own, we believe, their connexion with the Church. Training colleges for school-masters and mistresses—S. Mark's, Whitelands, Culham, Fishponds, &c. &c.—are gradually diffusing a healthy influence felt over the land; while the extension of parochial schools, in which Prayer-book religion forms the staple of teaching, is of course commensurate with that of churches and clergymen zealous in the Church cause. That cause, in a word, has struck deep into the educational system of the higher and of the lower classes. Its weak point still is the possession of the middle ground. The education of that growingly important class, those engaged in or dependent on retail commerce, and the cognate professions of mercantile clerks, and so forth, is still for the most part conducted in wretched private 'commercial schools,' where either no religion, or the most unsatisfactory kind of popular Protestantism is taught. All thinking men of right views acknowledge the deficiency, but no one, except Mr. Woodard, has yet had the courage to attempt a remedy on a large scale. In the meanwhile, palliatives from the low and the latitudinarian schools are presented; and in the growth of that well-intentioned but narrow and ill-instructed fraternity, the 'Christian Young Men,' much social inconvenience, as the *Saturday Review* not long since well pointed out, may be anticipated.

If we now turn to the devotional life of the Church, we shall find abundant cause for thankfulness and hope. Model services, in the rigid sense of the word, may yet be counted off in a small list. But the growth of correct Church building and restoration is such as to surprise the most sanguine of those who took an early part in the 'ecclesiological' movement; the relative standard is raised, irrespective of party; and it is sheer perversity alone which can dissuade even the Low Churchman

from imparting much that is solemn, æsthetic, and ecclesiastical, into the fabrics he raises. The *Ecclesiologist* for October contains, for example, the description of the professed 'low Church,' S. Simon's, Chelsea, which, however unsatisfactory and grotesque architecturally, is yet decidedly ecclesiastical in its spirit. Our cathedrals, witness Ely, Lichfield, Chichester, Peterborough, Oxford, Hereford, Carlisle, have, with more or less success, taken the lead in the restoration movement, and the number of parish churches which follow in their wake exempts us from any liability to quote examples. In the Established Church of Ireland (which already boasted the grandiose restoration at Armagh) a new cathedral, small, but strictly Churchlike in its appointments, is rising at Kilmore. The crowds that thronged All Saints', Margaret Street, during the last season, were a proof that it is not substantial beauty, nor sumptuousness, nor dignity, at which the popular mind is apt to take umbrage. The gorgeous structure at Haley Hill, near Halifax, built by that noble-hearted manufacturer, Mr. Akroyd, a former 'Liberal' M.P., and a convert by conviction to the Church, with its painted glass, its statues of scriptural and bas-reliefs of primitive saints, its mural paintings, its stalled chancel, its reredos with the cross flanked by the effigies of the assistants at the Divine Passion, opened with the general jubilation of a manufacturing town, and consecrated with expressions of warm praise by a prelate so little compromised to high Churchmanship as the present Bishop of Ripon, is a striking lesson how far the cause has succeeded in making good its footing. The love for choral services is every day increasing, and the aversion to them dying away. The anti-pew crusade, the symbolizing that is of the communion of saints in the arrangements of our churches, is now no longer any badge of party, but enlists the active co-operation of persons calling themselves Churchmen, of every hue of opinion. A quarter of a century back, our cathedrals were perhaps among the most unpopular of national institutions; they seemed to have been saved till then merely to be led to the sacrifice, amid the plaudits of a hostile people. Now they are, if anything, in danger of over-popularity. The greedy attempt of the Low Church party to steal a march in Exeter Hall, met by Mr. Edouart's perhaps too rigid line of opposition, has resulted in creating the *furor* not for cathedrals only and the cathedral chapters, but actually for choral services celebrated in those cathedrals by crowds of surpliced choirmen. We were not so much younger than we are now when the plea urged in these and cognate pages for using the cathedral naves was reckoned among the wildest of youthful dreams. In 1860 who dare to wag a tongue against the proposition?

Finally, the highest court of appeal has actually, now, gravely sanctioned a system of Church observance, which, however much it might have been before the judgment of 1857 esteemed by sensible men to be both lawful and right, could yet not point, as it now does, to any definite and clear decision of modern times given in its favour. We are not willing to reopen the vicissitudes of that controversy. We are now legally entitled to use, and we do use, the cross in close superposition to the altar, we clothe that altar with carpets varying according to the Christian season; we place the candles on it; we erect the table of prothesis hard by for the solemn offering; we fence the chancel with cancelli, we crown them, if occasion permits, with the cross of Christ. With such privileges, so deliberately granted to us by so grave and dispassionate a tribunal as the Judicial Committee, we should be well content.

Against such a weight of corporate success, it would be idle to allege that partial discomfiture, or any exhibition however disgusting and brutal of an antagonistic spirit, ought to afford us grounds for yielding to faintheartedness. We should, for example, not be inclined to note the miserable proceedings at S. George's-in-the-East, as any serious blow to the 'Church' cause. Words would, indeed, fail us to describe the loathing and indignation which we feel at the profanity, the ribaldry, and the sacrilege and blasphemy of those saturnalia of all evil, those witch sabbaths, which were for so many Sundays enacted in the Church of S. George's-in-the-East. That the authorities did their duty, as they might have done, in repressing them, we deny. That the public testified as it ought to do, their sense of the national shame involved, we refuse to admit. Palliation there was absolutely none for the offence. 'Oh, but the rioters were non-parishioners, and were merely drawn there by the love of excitement.' Very well then, we answer, so much the worse for the condition of the public peace in the Tower Hamlets, which permits those hordes of barbarians to convert the Lord's house into a fighting-ground, and the Lord's day into a bacchanalian orgy. But supposing the rioters were parishioners, would it have mended the matter? He would be a bold man that, with the slightest knowledge of what the parish of S. George's-in-the-East really is, would dare give an affirmative answer. A more appalling sight than the cosmopolitan ruffianism, the flaunting harlotry of Ratcliffe Highway, on a Sunday, cannot be witnessed. In plain English, the parish is simply a *colluvies gentium*, the nautical quarter of a great commercial city. The idea that this mob cared for or knew the difference between a chasuble and a box-coat is utterly ridiculous to suppose; but even if there were any colourable connexion between the disturbances and the vestments

which Mr. Bryan King had adopted, his abandonment of them at the Bishop of London's instance has cut away this miserable pretext. In short, the whole disturbance is clearly traceable to the party dodge of setting up Mr. Hugh Allen, under an unfortunate Act of Parliament, as co-incumbent. For many years Mr. Bryan King had gone on with his choral services, and for a long time with his vestments. He had emptied the Church, but he kept the peace. Mr. Allen, a specimen of the popular clerical agitator, came, and then Club-law reigned. It suited the newspapers to take up the case in the dull season, but when they had used it sufficiently, as might be supposed, they turned round and pooh-poohed the whole affair.

Still, we should not be acting honestly if we professed to think that Mr. King was well advised in his restoration of the vestments. As to their perfect legality we have no doubt. The rubric plainly declares it, and that rubric received an authoritative interpretation by the Privy Council judgment of 1857, while their use has been maintained by the custom of the Archbishop of Canterbury, the Dean of Westminster, &c. wearing their copes at ceremonials of high state import. Neither can Popery be reasonably imputed to a garment which is in constant use in the Protestant communities of Scandinavia and of much of North Germany, together with crucifixes on the altars, as the Evangelical Alliance found out to its consternation at Berlin, when shown into a church so fitted as their place of sitting. Still, the reassumption in our Church of vestments of which the very name had faded out of the mind, must be treated as a question, not of strict law, but of policy, unless indeed we are prepared to say that every celebrating priest is bound, irrespective of consequences, and without delay, to assume his chasuble. Well, then, as a question of policy and not of strict law, was Mr. King well advised when he did so? We doubt it, not so much on account of the rioting which has been the characteristic of S. George's this year, as of the apathy which seems to have been its normal condition for a long time previously. The Church revival owes its strength to the fact that it carried with it a popular feeling, not always a *majority* popular feeling, but a feeling sufficient in almost every locality to rally round the clergyman a knot of sincere and courageous friends, and in cases like those of S. Mary Magdalene, S. Barnabas, S. Peter's at Leeds, Kidderminster, S. Ninian's at Perth, &c. &c., to create crowded and enthusiastic congregations. To this feeling we owe (to quote the latest instance) the Church at Halifax, to which we have recently referred. Such being the case, it becomes our duty to ascertain what portions of the *ideal* 'Catholic system' seem to have made good their hold of the

popular feeling in the nineteenth century in England, and what have not. We think we shall have little difficulty in perceiving that architecture and constructive ritualism have won the day; that the cause of iconography on wall, or canvas, or window, or embodied in sculptured stone, has triumphed; that choral services with the accompaniment of surpliced choirs are becoming every day more common, and more approved by the public mind. To foster and to encourage all these gains upon Puritanism, is surely enough for at least one generation. On the contrary, after about a quarter of a century's existence of the ecclesiological movement, the revival of vestments can still at the best muster but a scanty and archæological following. It may be intensely illogical that aristocratic and polished England cannot tolerate ceremonial which is the daily food of rude and democratised Norway. But such things do not go by logic; and we think that the clergyman, whether in London or in the country, who would risk the success of a church—catholic in its architecture and appointments, frequent celebrations, and constant choral surpliced services—for a chasuble, would be more bold than wise. The vestment revival has about it the unlucky feature that—most unjustly we own and unfairly, but still colourably—it is open like nothing else to the charge of self-seeking, inasmuch as the object ornamented is not the building or the service, but the actual person of the officiator. Thence perhaps its non-popularity. But without analyzing the question further, we strongly advise our friends to rest content with the implicit connexion with all other branches—Greek, Roman, and (assumedly) Swedish—of the Universal Church, which the theoretical legality of the vestments gives, and to labour in those other fields of ecclesiological revival which are obviously such as bear the stamp of possibility and popularity in the amount of general sympathy they have already won. When every church in England has its stalled chancel, duly filled with its surpliced choir, when every church has at least its weekly celebration, at its altar duly surmounted (we are not too nice in asking in what form or material) with the emblem of salvation,—then, and not till then, we may enter into inquiries which are now premature.

We are aware that we are open to the retort, that had similar counsels of prudence existed in the earliest days of ecclesiology, no ground might have been secured. But this retort blinks the real point at issue. At first starting ecclesiology was, of course, daring, as much as it was tentative. The experience of more than twenty years has changed its experimental character into that of a cause which has gathered its own experience upon which to form its own conclusions.

What we have argued is the conclusion in our own minds of that experience.

The Church has equally displayed its revived force in its aspect of the consoler. Need we advert to the Penitentiary movement, that blessed work of the saintly Bishop Armstrong? We only wish that other institutions of charity, intended not for the refuge and reformation of the fallen, but for the protection of the innocent—institutions like the House of Charity, in Rose Street, Soho, had equally flourished. It was well to have met the pressing need of penitentiaries, but it was not so well to have directed a too exclusive zeal to this one work. The Sisters of Mercy movement has indeed attracted considerable attention, and drawn into its system ardent self-sacrificing souls, but somehow it has not made the progress which wants such as those, which it is intended to meet would apparently have opened out. We fear that it may perhaps have been started without enough attention having been directed towards blending it with things as they are at the present day. Perhaps also it was somewhat inverting the course of nature to suppose that women would learn to live in community in the Church of England before some system of corporate living and action for men suitable to present circumstances had been devised. Some Mission Colleges, such as S. Paul's, Soho, have been created, but the number is still very small, and from various circumstances neither S. Saviour's, Leeds, nor All Saints', Margaret Street, now exhibit that character as their founders desired. Besides, while England is studded in its almost every town and many a village with almshouses and such foundations—the majority of them the creation of a strong religious movement in the sixteenth, seventeenth, and early eighteenth centuries, but with a considerable sprinkling of ante-reformational date—many of them possessing their chapels and rules of public worship according to the Church system, no adequate attempt on the part of Churchmen has been made to breathe life into these dry bones, while the 'Reformatory' movement has been suffered to assume a complexion of very mitigated Churchmanship.

With so cheering a roll to refer to of the successes, not indeed unchequered, but still numerous and decisive, of the Church 'cause,' we may be asked, why then do we regret the abeyance of the Church 'party'? Is not a 'cause' a grander and a more sacred thing than any 'party'? Assuredly it is; but yet we earnestly wish that the Church party could have kept better united, not for partizan and factious objects, but in order to promote that cause, in order, if need were, to check any partizan feeling among Churchmen which might have threatened, in the interests of clique (that caricature of party), to postpone

the welfare of the cause itself. Man, gregarious creature as he is, must, by the law of his being, act in all public matters according to some system of parties, great or small. If these parties are great, they can act in a large hearted spirit; if they are small, they become cliques. In this inaction of the Church party the Church cause has been served by Church cliques, and numerous isolated fields of activity, not strictly coming under the heads of synodical action, missionary work, education, devotion, or consolation, have been opened out. So far so good. Organizations like Mr. Meyrick's excellent and active Anglo-Continental Society, and the no less admirable Anglo-American Society, of which Dr. Caswall and Mr. Dickinson are the chief managers, for passing English emigrants to the United States safe into the hands of the American Church, not to mention Lord John Manners' long-established Tithe Redemption Trust, are of unmitigated benefit. But elsewhere, in various quarters, the spirit of clique, we fear, dissipates strength which, with a vigilant and united Church party under arms, would have been concentrated towards winning still more solid successes for the Church cause. It is not too late for the Church party again to rally; and we say to it, 'Rally, but do so with wisdom, and above all things be sure of the leaders whom you select.' Churchmen were caught asleep when the agitation for legalizing marriage with a deceased wife's sister was revived. Happily, not too late, a machinery, specially meant to oppose this mischief, has been constructed; and, still more happily, it includes among its workers men prominent in the councils of the 'Low' no less than those of the 'High' Church side, while it is headed by Dean Trench, a man eminently calculated to conciliate their varying interests. Upon such a co-operation for such a cause we cannot but earnestly pray for the divine blessing. Still it was no credit to the Church party that it happened to be at the time without sufficient organization satisfactorily to resist the aggression.

Again: the agitation which has recently sprung up under the lead of the impulsive Lord Ebury, to expunge Church doctrine from the Prayer-Book—(we like calling a spade a spade)—ought to have been met at its first outset by the collective voice of some body representing the Church party. If ever Churchmen had reason to see their want of wisdom in having allowed the London Church Union to fall into inactivity, it was upon the occasion of the anti-Prayer-Book movement. That that movement will be frustrated by a collective opposition to it, we have not the slightest doubt; such has already been started; but we assert, it would have been more quickly and more effectually quelled if the Church party had not broken up

its phalanx. That it should be put down is, humanly speaking, a matter of life and death to the Church cause; for with the excision of the Catholic Faith from the Prayer-Book we may safely say that the life if not the essence of a Church would have departed from our Establishment. Excision of the Catholic Faith may sound a strong term, but we refuse to apply any milder language to the mutilations which those friends of Lord Ebury, whose petition he has thought proper to commit to the especial notice of the London Churchwardens, desire to inflict upon the Baptismal and other Services, and to the omission of the Absolution in the Visitation of the Sick. By the side of such a conflict as this, any dispute about temporalities might seem a small matter; but the attitude which the 'Society for the Liberation of Religion from State Control' has assumed with respect to Church-rates has totally altered the complexion of the Church-rate question. It is now no longer denied that these are merely the *cheval de bataille* for an onslaught on the Church itself, as an object of hatred alike in its spiritual and its social character to that society, and the society must accordingly be resisted to the utmost. Its impudent 'Endowed School Bill' is another proof of its real object, though, in this case, the very coarseness of the assault caused its defeat for the time being. The Church may well and reasonably consider what concessions it can make to the individual consciences of genuine Dissenters, while declining to give the Dissenters so relieved any further voice in Church affairs; but to surrender Church-rates at the dictum of the Liberation Society would be to do something far worse than merely abandoning an ancient right, and a material possession, out of cowardice or false love of popularity.

Here is work enough of the defensive sort for a Church 'party'—the maintenance of the residue of our marriage law, the defence of the Prayer-book, the foiling of the 'Liberation' conspiracy. But there is more behind which ought not to be neglected. Who is to watch—if watching is all that is left to us—lest public morality should be utterly sapped by the pernicious working of the nefarious and execrable Divorce Act—who is ready to sound the alarm if that Act should be still further extended? Then there are the perils from weak brethren—the oppositions of Puritanism and latitudinarianism—the nerveless, colourless, unreliable character of 'young men' religion—the fanaticism of Cummingism and Spurgeonism, and below all the fathomless abyss of infidelity. We pass over trials of the faith like those in Scotland. Will the Church cause ever triumph over these? will it ever win the other Apostolic communities of the world from their presumptuous additions to the one Faith,

and link them in a visible unity? Who can answer? If the Church cause lives—and live we believe it will do—this life is enough for men to hope for, though not enough to pray for.

‘Thy kingdom come’ is our prayer; but when will it come? ‘When the Son of Man comes, shall He find faith upon the earth?’ Most of us, probably all, when we were younger, dreamed of a bright conclusion to the Church movement—the whole Church purified and re-united—the patriarchs of Rome, Constantinople, and Canterbury worshipping at the same altar—separatists flocking in by shoals to the one true Church. Happy dreams! But nowhere did we read of them in Scripture. Union indeed and purity there are to be, but they will be found in the New Jerusalem, with new heavens and a new earth. To cherish such imaginations, still more to anticipate with the slightest expectation that they could come to pass in our own day, was perhaps a thought of presumption more akin than we should willingly acknowledge to that widely spread delusion which opens the Apocalypse to trace the politics of the passing hour. To rejoice when the cause is triumphant, to mourn when it is depressed, to do daily and hourly battle against its foes, to be charitable and moderate in success, to be bold and cheerful under reverses; this is, we believe, for many a long year, the vocation of the living soldier of the Church cause. He will never, we believe, see upon earth that which he once anticipated—the ‘angel face’ of visible unity; but its symbol and its ideal should ever be before his mind, and thus will he descry,

‘Wet with the mists, and smitten by the lights,
The Dragon of the Great Pendragonship
Blaze, making all the night a steam of fire.’

The mists are heavy, and the night lowers, but the emblem of Christianity, of conscience, of settled rule and high morality, ‘the Dragon of the Great Pendragonship,’ still blazes heavenward.

ART. IV.—1. *Missale Ambrosianum, novissime* JOSEPH CARDINALIS PUTEOBONELLI, *Archiepiscopi, auctoritate recognitum*. Mediolani: 1768. Typis Joannis Baptistæ de Sirturis. Impress. Archiepiscopal.

2. *Missale Ambrosianum, CAROLI CAJETANI CARDINALIS DE GAISRUCK, Archiepiscopi, auctoritate recognitum*. Novissime impressum. Mediolani: Apud Jacobum Agnelli, Typographum Archiepiscopalem.

THE reader is asked, at the outset, to regard the present paper as the third of a series. In the first, we endeavoured to elucidate the theory of the Roman Liturgy; in the second, we entered at some length into the Mozarabic and Gallican Missal; and in the present, we propose to do as much for the Ambrosian. Some questions, which have been previously discussed at length, we shall therefore feel ourselves at liberty here to consider settled; and it will be our endeavour to avoid repeating now what we have investigated before.

The Ambrosian, like the Mozarabic and Gallican, is a branch of the Ephesine family. All three have been moulded by contact with the Petrine Liturgy; but the Ambrosian, as it might be expected, most of all. It is a living rite, theoretically co-extensive with the province of Milan,—and in this respect of far greater importance than the Mozarabic, now confined to the Chapel in Toledo, and to the three other parishes where it is authorised. But in every other point of view, it is immeasurably inferior to the Spanish Rite; and had the Gallican existed long enough to have taken a status of development like her two sisters, we believe that she also would have been superior to the Milanese. We say, theoretically co-extensive with the province of Milan, because, in point of fact, in the Swiss portion of it, the Roman Rite is used and clung to with marvellous tenacity; insomuch that when Cardinal de Gaisruck endeavoured to substitute the Ambrosian Liturgy, the popular outburst of feeling exclaimed, '*Êther Romans or Lutherans!*'

First, we will give a hasty sketch of the fortunes of the Church of Milan during those centuries in which her ritual was assuming its present form; then explain the division of its ecclesiastical year; the framework of its Missæ; and then its particular beauties and defects as compared with the cognate Mozarabic or Gallican forms.

Italy, then, in the earliest ages, was divided into the Roman

and Italic provinces, under the respective headships of Rome and Milan. During the era of persecution, it may safely be said that these two were much on a par: after that period, the one was continually weakened by abstracted provinces, the other continually augmented by means, the recital of which forms one great part of Church History. At an uncertain time, but about A.D. 400, Aquileia became independent of Milan, and vindicated to itself the Primacy of Venetia and Istria. In A.D. 447, the See of Ravenna in like manner claimed the Primacy of the Flaminia and part of the Æmilia; and by these two losses the See of S. Ambrose lost much of the dignity that it had enjoyed previously to and during the pontificate of that great Father.

During his Episcopate, we find the difference between the Roman and Milanese uses, more particularly in the observance of the Saturday, very striking. Yet probably the ritual which he left was the mere kernel or nucleus of that now called the Ambrosian. It was, on the whole, more like the Eastern formulæ than was the Roman; at the same time, in one particular, the variety and distinctions of its Prefaces or Illations, it was further removed from the immutability of the Antiochene and Thaddæan families. An interesting article might be written on the traces which remain in the genuine works of S. Ambrose of the Liturgy which existed at his time.

S. Simplician, his successor (A.D. 397—400), is said to have made considerable additions to the formulæ then in use: this may be true; but the very short period of his pontificate must have cramped his designs. It is better to assume that during the whole of the First Epoch of the Post-Ambrosian Church—that which preceded the capture of Milan by Attila (A.D. 397—452)—the Liturgy was more and more assuming completeness, and settling into the definite arrangement of the various Missal Antiphons. Great names ruled the Italic province during that period: S. Venerius for eight years; S. Marolus for fifteen; S. Martinianus for thirteen; S. Glycerius for three; S. Lazarus for eleven; S. Eusebius for fourteen. During the pontificate of the last-named Bishop it was, that the ‘Scourge of GOD,’ having already devastated Northern Italy, fell, in A.D. 452, on Milan. The Bishop, guessing by natural prudence, or forewarned by supernatural agency of the impending ruin, led his flock towards the Maritime and Cottian Alps; and on their return, when Attila had retreated, that restoration of the Great Basilic, better known by the name of *Intramurana*, took place, which has left its stamp on the Ambrosian Calendar to all ages. The great flaw of the Mozarabic, as every one knows, is that beyond the Seventh Sunday after Trinity there is no further Dominical Office till we come to the Kalends of November; so that for

ten or twelve Sundays in the summer the same office is repeated again and again. This would have been the case at Milan; but the time is now well filled up by the occurrence of the Feast of Dedication on the third Sunday in October; the two former Sundays of that month being taken up in preparation for it: and, by the observance of the Decollation of S. John Baptist, with its train of following Sundays.

We are inclined, then, to fix the end of the First Epoch of the Ambrosian Rite to the return of the exiled citizens in 453. The homily delivered on that occasion by the most celebrated preacher of his time, S. Maximus of Turin, and which is still extant, used to be read on the occasion of this Festival, till the last restoration of the Great Basilic, by S. Charles Borromeo.

During the Second Epoch, from thence to the inauguration of the Gothic kings (A.D. 453—493), the Ambrosian Office probably perfected its most important parts. From a careful examination of its Prefaces, and a comparison between them and the relics of ecclesiastical writers of that place and time, this fact, we think, might be made pretty clear; and it is curious that the scholars of Italy have not devoted themselves to an inquiry so full of interest and importance. During this epoch, five Prelates held the See of S. Ambrose; all of them reckoned among the saints—S. Geruntius, S. Benignus, S. Senator, S. Theodorus I., S. Laurentius I.

The Third Epoch is under the Gothic kings, and lasts from A.D. 493 to 568. It also saw five Pontificates, four Prelates out of the five being saints—S. Eustorgius II., S. Magnus, S. Datius, Vitalis, S. Auxanus. During this epoch, the lesser hymns and lections, the Psalmelli, Epistolellæ, Offertories, Transitories, and Confractories, appear to have formed themselves as they now are.

The Fourth Epoch is that of the Lombardic kings, from A.D. 568 to 739; and it is ecclesiastically important from the Aquileian schism of the Three Chapters. The reader is aware that on the condemnation of these Chapters, in the teeth of the Pope, by the Fifth Œcumenical Council, the Primate of Aquileia headed the dissentients from that condemnation; and, taking to himself the title of Patriarch, dealt his anathemas about pretty freely to the rest of the Church.

The schism thus commenced lasted more than a century. During this time the See of Milan was occupied by twelve prelates, of whom seven only are reckoned among the saints; namely, S. Honoratus, Laurentius II., Constantius, Adeodatus, Asterius, Fortis, S. Joannes Bonus, S. Antoninus, S. Mauricillus, S. Ampellius, S. Mansuetus, S. Benedictus, Theodorus II. And in this time we may fairly conclude that the book finally assumed the general character that it now possesses.

We will now proceed to the Office itself; and it will be most convenient to give, in the first place, the Dominical arrangement of its ecclesiastical year, which is very peculiar. The reader will perhaps understand it better if we take an actual year,—that on which we have just entered.

Jan.	1. Circumcision.		17. Third Sun. after Pent.
	8. First Sunday after Epiphany.	July	24. Fourth "
	15. Second "		1. Fifth "
	22. Third "		8. Sixth "
	29. Fourth "		15. Seventh "
Feb.	5. Septuagesima.		22. Eighth "
	12. Sexagesima.	August	29. Ninth "
	19. Quinquagesima.		5. Tenth "
	20. Lent begins.		12. Eleventh "
	26. Quadragesima.		19. Twelfth "
March	4. Sunday of the Samaritan.	Sept.	26. Thirteenth "
	11. " Abraham.		2. First after Decollation.
	18. " The Blind Man.		9. Second "
	25. " Lazarus.		16. Third "
	31. Saturday of the Tradition of the Symbol.		23. Fourth "
April	1. Palm Sunday.	Oct.	30. Fifth "
	8. Easter Day.		7. First Sunday in October.
	15. First Sunday after Easter.		14. Sunday before Dedication.
	22. Second "		21. Dedication.
	29. Third "		28. First Sunday after Dedication.
May	6. Fourth "	Nov.	4. Second "
	13. Fifth "		11. Third "
	17. Ascension Day.		18. First Sunday in Advent.
	20. Sunday after Ascension.		25. Second "
	27. Whitsunday.	Dec.	2. Third "
June	3. Trinity Sunday.		9. Fourth "
	10. Second Sunday after Pentecost.		16. Fifth "
			23. Sixth "

We will next give a table of the analogous changeable portions of the Ambrosian, Mozarabic, and Roman Missals; we shall thus be in a condition to judge of the respective beauties of each.

AMBROSIAN.	MOZARABIC.	ROMAN.
1. Ingressa.	1. Ad Missam Officium.	1. Introitus.
2. Oratio super populum.	2. Oratio.	2. Oratio. <i>Collect for the Day.</i>
3. Prophetia.	3. Prophetia.	
4. Psalmellus.	4. Psallendo.	
5. Epistola.	5. Epistola.	5. Epistola.
6. Canticum.	6. <i>Sometimes</i> Tractus.	6. Graduale, <i>sometimes</i> Sequentia.
7. Evangelium.	7. Evangelium.	7. Evangelium.
8. Antiphona post Evangelium.	8. Lauda.	

AMBROSIAN.	MOZARABIC.	ROMAN.
9. Oratio super sindonem.		
10. Offertorium.	10. Sacrificium.	10. Offertorium.
11. Oratio super oblatam.	11. Missa.	
	12. Alia Oratio.	
	13. Post Nomina.	
	14. Ad Pacem.	
15. Præfatio.	15. Illatio.	15. Præfatio.
	16. Post Sanctus.	
	17. Post Pridie.	
18. Confractorium.	18. Ad Confractionem.	
	19. Ad Orationem Dominicam.	
	20. Benedictio.	
21. Transitorium.	21. Ad accedentes, or ad accedendum.	
	22. Communio.	
23. Oratio post Communionem.	23. Oratio.	23. Postcommunio.

We will now take these in order.

The Ambrosian *Ingressa* differs from the Mozarabic and Roman in its construction; not consisting, as they do, of an anthem broken by V. and R., but a simple consecutive clause. Perhaps in the beauty of these Milan may challenge any other Liturgy; and every ritualist knows of how great importance it is that the key-note of the whole service, the Antiphon, so to speak, of the whole hymn of praise, should be expressive. Let us take the six Sundays of Advent as examples in each.

AMBROSIAN.

1. Unto Thee, O Lord, do I lift up my soul: my God, I have put my trust in Thee: O let me not be confounded, neither let mine enemies triumph over me. For all those that seek Thee shall not be confounded.

MOZARABIC.

1. Behold upon the mountains the feet of him that evangeliseth peace, Alleluia, that announceth good things, Alleluia: celebrate, O Judah, thy Festivals, Alleluia, and perform to the Lord thy vows. Alleluia. *V.* The LORD gave the word: great was the company of the preachers. *Ps.* And perform. *V.* Glory and honour to the Father and to the Son and to the Holy Ghost. *Ps.* And perform. *V.* For ever and ever.

The Ambrosian *Ingressa* for the first Sunday in Advent is the same as the Roman, though a little abbreviated. To our taste, as the opening of the season, the Mozarabic is the finer, nevertheless.

2. Remember us, O Lord, according to the favour that Thou bearest unto Thy people: O visit us with

2. Get thee up upon the high mountain, thou that evangelisest to Sion, lift up thy voice with strength, thou

Thy salvation. That we may see the felicity of Thy chosen, and rejoice in the gladness of Thy people, and give thanks with Thine inheritance.

3. His fruit shall be lifted up above Lebanon, and they shall flourish out of the city like grass upon the earth: and His Name shall be blessed for ever: and His Name shall remain before the sun, and His seat before the moon for ever and ever: and in Him shall the ends of the earth be blessed.

Observe that, though the Ambrosian Ingressa comes a great deal nearer to the Italian than it does to the Vulgate Version, yet it is not exactly the same with either; on which we shall have more to say presently.

4. The voice of him that crieth in the wilderness: Prepare ye the way of the LORD: make straight in the desert a high-way for our GOD.

5. Drop down, ye heavens, from above, and let the clouds rain the Righteous One: let the earth be opened, and let it hnd forth the Saviour.

6. Dost thou behold Elizabeth discoursing with Mary the Mother of God: Why hast thou come to me, Mother of thy God? Had I known it, I would have come to meet thee. For thou bearest the Ruler, and I the Prophet: thou the Lawgiver,—and I the Law-receiver: thou the Word, and I the Voice that proclaimeth the Saviour.

that evangelisest to Jerusalem. Say to the cities of Judah, Alleluia, Alleluia. *V.* Our GOD shall manifestly come, our GOD, and shall not keep silence. Alleluia. *Ps.* Say. *V.* Glory and honour. *Ps.* Say.

3. Behold, the glory of the LORD shall be revealed. Alleluia. And all flesh shall see, Alleluia. That the mouth of the LORD hath spoken it. Alleluia. *V.* Our GOD shall manifestly come: our GOD, and shall not keep silence, Alleluia. *Ps.* That the. *V.* Glory and honour. *Ps.* That the.

4. *As the first.*

5. *As the second.*

6. Holy LORD GOD Omnipotent: Which is, and was, and is to come: Alleluia, Alleluia. *V.* Our GOD shall manifestly come: our GOD, and shall not keep silence. Alleluia. *Ps.* Which is. *V.* Glory and honour. *Ps.* Which is.

The last Ingressa is from S. Ambrose himself; and this is the case in several other instances. We are not sure that, in these Advent Introits, Milan has always the advantage over Toledo: the Antiphons of the former are more subjective—to use a word we greatly dislike—especially the earlier ones. But it is a sad flaw in the Mozarabic office to have a repetition, without sense or beauty, of two Introits, so unlike the superabounding fullness of that ritual in many cases.

There is nothing more profitable to ritualists than—if we may borrow a term from another art—*comparative* ecclesiology; and we propose to introduce a little in the course of this paper. Notice, in the Roman Introits, that the first is the same as the first in both Ambrosian and Mozarabic; and that the fourth is

the same as the fifth of Milan, and exquisitely beautiful it is. The second is—'People of Sion, behold the Lord cometh to 'save the nations: and the Lord shall cause the glory of his 'voice to be heard in the joy of your heart. *Ps.* Give ear, O 'Thou Shepherd of Israel, Thou that leadest Joseph like a sheep. 'V. Glory.' The third is simply—'Rejoice in the Lord alway,' &c. But it is to be observed, that the *Rorate* of the fourth Sunday is not Gregorian. In the original office it is, 'Remember me, O Lord, with the favour that Thou bearest unto Thy people,'—with the rest. This is retained in many German Missals, as, for example, the Halberstadt and the Nuremberg; also in our own. When was it altered? The old Introit is retained in Durandus (who wrote in 1286). But then here is a difficulty. Sicardus,¹ who died in 1214, speaks of it as a modern one (wherein he is mistaken): still this would seem to prove that the *Rorate* was already employed in some places.

We must return to our proper subject, and will proceed to point out some examples on which we think the Ambrosian Ingressa singularly happy. That for Christmas Day is curious, from its peculiar reading: 'Rejoice, O barren, *thou that wast 'athirst:*'² let the desert be glad: rejoice, O ye waste places of 'Judah, for our Lord hath come and redeemed us.' That for New Year's Day is of the most venerable antiquity, and clearly referable to a period when Paganism was still a persecuting power, in allusion to the heathen festival of the New Year. We are not aware that this has ever been pointed out; but, so far as our reading goes, this is the oldest bit of any peculiar *Missa* (always excepting No. IV. of the Reichenau collection) which remains. 'In the sight of the Gentiles fear ye not; but 'do ye in your hearts adore and fear the Lord: for his angel is 'with you.' (Baruch vi. 5.) On the Epiphany, while the Roman gives us 'Behold, the Lord the Ruler cometh, and in His Hand is glory, and might, and empire,'—an Antiphon of no especial propriety,—and the Mozarabic refers to the ancient Spanish custom of public Baptism at Epiphany, the Ambrosian has, with exquisite beauty, 'The city hath no need either of the 'sun or of the moon to lighten it, for God is the brightness of it.

¹ His words are:—'In quo utero videns gentilitas calceatam fore Divinitatem in Introitu secundum quosdam modernos, clamat ad eam, dicens, Memento nostri,' &c. *Mitrale* v. 4, p. 214. CD. We have been asked, why in former papers on Ritual in the *Christian Remembrancer* we have made so much use of this author, who is never quoted by the Master Ritualists of the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries. The *Mitrale* of Sicardus was only for the first time printed by the Abbé Migne, in 1855: those great men, therefore, had no opportunity of referring to a book which it is as necessary that the modern ritualist should have at his finger ends as Durandus or Hugh of St. Victor or Rupert.

² *Quæ sitiēbas.* The Vulgate, both in Isaiah and in the Galatians, gives simply, *Quæ non paris.*

'And the nations shall walk in its light; and the kings of the earth do bring their glory and honour unto it.' It looks past, we see, the Lord's Epiphany, wrought once that it might be wrought for ever, and fixes its gaze on that great and true *ἐπιφάνεια* of his glory, the new heavens and the new earth.

Quicumque Christum queritis
Oculos in altum tollite:
Illic licebit visere
Regale signum gloriæ.

Septuagesima has a happy Introit. 'I know the thoughts that I think towards you, saith the Lord, that they are thoughts of peace and not of bitterness: ye shall call upon Me, and I will hear you: and will bring back your captivity from all places.' The Roman has only: 'The pains of hell came about me,' &c. which, though Gregorian, is rather poor. The Mozarabic, as every one knows, has no such special Sunday.

Quinquagesima presents a very singular feature. We give the Ingressa in the original. 'Jucunda est præsens vita, et transit: terribile est, Christe, judicium tuum, et permanet. Quapropter incertum honorem relinquamus, et de infinito timore cogitemus, clamantes,—Christe, miserere nobis.' Now this is almost word for word a translation of a Troparion in the Triodion for the same Sunday: a visible proof of the close connexion between Milan and the East. It is remarkable that the *Invocabit me* is common both to Milan and Rome for the first Sunday in Lent; in the Ambrosian ritual, however, it goes through the *Missa* of the week: in the Roman, not so.

We have no observation to make on the Ingressa till we come to the Sundays after Pentecost. Here there is a remarkable agreement between the Roman and Ambrosian. The Mozarabic, up to the seventh Sunday after Pentecost, beyond which there is no office, has the unvaried 'Dominus regnavit, decorem indutus est,' &c. But the following table is worth attention:—

AMBROSIAN.

II. <i>after Pentecost.</i>	Justus es, Domine, et rectum judicium tuum: fac cum servo tuo secundum misericordiam tuam.	Is not in the Roman.
III. "	Factus est Dñus protector meus: et eduxit me in latitudinem: saluum me fecit, quoniam voluit me.	Is the Introit, <i>without the Psalm</i> , for the II. Sunday in the Roman.

In this Introit, Durandus finds a reference to the Gospel, that of the great feast, where—

Villa, boves, uxor, coenam clausere vocatis:
Mundus, cura, caro, cœlum clausere renatis.

But the Ambrosian Gospel is on a totally different subject: the blind leading the blind in S. Luke.

IV. & XIII. after Pentecost.

V. & XIV.	„	Exaudi, Domine, vocem meam quâ clamavi ad te: Tibi dixit cor meum: Quæsit te vultus meus: vultum tuum, Domine, requiram.	Is that of the V.
		Respice in me — peccata mea, Deus meus.	Does not occur.
VI. & XV.	„	Dominus illuminatio mea — — ceciderunt.	Is that of the IV.
X.	„	Inclina, Domine, aurem tuam, et exaudi me: salvum fac servum tuum, Deus meus, sperantem in te. miserere mihi: quoniam ad te clamavi tota die.	Is the XIV.
XI.	„	Justus es, Domine, et rectum judi- cium tuum. Fac cum servo tuo secundum misericordiam tuam.	Is the XVII.

The following Ingressæ are the same:—

		After Decollat.	
After Pentecost.		10	4
	2	11	5
	3	12	
	4	13	
	5	14	
	6	15	1 after Dedication.
	7	After Decollat.	2 after Dedication.
		1	1 of October.
	8	2	2 of October.
	9	3	3 after Dedication.

No doubt, originally, the first after Pentecost was the same as the tenth and twentieth: though afterwards altered for the later Festival of Trinity. The 3d of October, the Festival of the Dedication, has the following:—

‘Ye, who are about to pass over this Jordan, build an altar to the LORD of rough stone which iron hath not touched: and ye shall offer on it whole burnt sacrifices, and peace offerings to our GOD:’

which is the Mozarabic Introit for the three times of solemn public baptism.

From the *Ingressa*, we proceed to the Missal Litany, which is only said on the Sundays of Lent. There are but two; the melody is very grand, and the words are precisely of the form of a Greek ectene. That which is said on the first, third, and fifth Sundays, is as follows:—

Divinæ pacis, et indulgentiæ munera supplicantes, ex
toto corde et ex tota anima precamur te:

Domine, miserere.

Pro Ecclesiâ tuâ Catholicâ, quæ hic, et per universum orbem diffusa est.

R. Domine, miserere.

V. Pro Papâ nostro II. et Pontifice nostro II. et omni clero eorum, omnibusque sacerdotibus ac ministris.

V. Pro famulo tuo II. Imperatore et Rege nostro, et omni exercitu ejus.

V. Pro pace Ecclesiarum, vocatione Gentium et quiete populorum.

V. Pro civitate hâc et conversione ejus omnibusque habitantibus in eâ.

V. Pro aeris temperiâ, et fructu et fecunditate terrarum.

V. Pro virginibus, viduis, orphanis, captivis, ac penitentibus.

V. Pro navigantibus, iter agentibus, in carceribus, in vinculis, in metallis, in exiliis, constitutis.

V. Pro iis qui diversis calamitatibus detinentur, quique spiritibus vexantur immundis.

V. Pro iis qui in sanctâ tuâ Ecclesiâ fructus misericordiæ largiuntur.

But we now wish to draw the reader's attention to a very remarkable fact, which, so far as we know, has not yet been noticed by ritualists: that the Mozarabic ectenæ are metrical. They are printed as prose, and have contracted various errors, which make them read like prose; but their metrical character is clear enough when once pointed out. And we think we shall be doing a service to ritualists if we print them here for the first time as they ought to be. We confess that, if we shall persuade the reader to think with us, we shall feel a little natural pride at having observed an important peculiarity, which had escaped the notice of Lorenzana, of Lesley, and even of Arevali. Here then they follow:—

MISSAL LITANY FOR THE FIRST SUNDAY IN LENT.

- | | |
|---------------------------|--|
| A 1. Jesu Unigenite | Da peccatis finem. |
| Dei Patris Fili, qui | Da laboris requiem. |
| Es universæ | Placare. |
| Bonitatis Dominus: | |
| Placare et miserere. | C 1. Tranquillitatem temporum, |
| A 2. Cuncti te gemitibus | Rerum abundantiam, |
| Exorantes poscimus: | Pacis quietem, et salutis copiam. |
| Cuncti ¹ simul | Placare. |
| Deprecantes quæsumus. | C 2. Illius ² Pontificis |
| Placare. | Porrigere præsidium: |
| B 1. Tua jam clementia | Ac ³ universo supplicanti populo. |
| Mala nostra superet: | Placare. |
| Tuo jam sereno | |
| Vultu in nos respice. | C 3. Remissionem omnium |
| Placare. | Peccatorum quæsumus: |
| B 2. Remove perpetuo | Indulge clemens mala quæ com- |
| Tuam iracundiam: | misimus, Placare. |

¹ So we read for *cunctique*: the conjunction, even if there were no metrical reason, would clearly be better away.

² *Illius* being the mere 'M. or N.' of our own offices, metre must not be looked for.

³ So read for *atque*.

MISSAL LITANY FOR THE SECOND SUNDAY IN LENT.

- A 1. Prostrati omnes lacrymas producimus :
Et pandimus¹ occulta, quæ admisimus :
A te, Deus, veniam poscimus.²
Quia peccavimus tibi.
- A 2. Orationes sacerdotum accipe :
Et quæque poscunt,³ affluenter tribue :
Ac tuæ plebi miserere, Domine.
Quia.
- A 3. Furorem tuum adduxisti super nos :
Nostra delicta dira⁴ curvaverunt nos :
Et absque ulla spe * * defecimus.
Quia.
- B. Traditi sumus malis, quæ nescimus :
Et omne malum cecidit super nos :
Et invocavimus,⁵ et non audimur.
Quia.
- A 4. Omnes clamamus : omnes te requirimus :
Te pœnitentes lacrymis prosequimur :
Cujusque⁶ iram ipsi provocavimus.
Quia.
- A 5. Te, deprecantes, te, gementes, poscimus ;
Te, Jesu Christe, prosternati petimus :
Tua potestas jam sublevet miseros.
Quia.
- A 6. Confessionem tuæ plebis accipe,
Quam lamentantes coram te effundimus :
Et pro admissis corde ingemiscimus.
Quia.
- A 7. Pacem rogamus, pacem nobis tribue ;
Amove bella, et nos omnes erue ;
Humili prece postulamus, Domine.
Quia.
- A 8. Inclina aurem, Deus clementissime ;
Jam abluantur delictorum maculæ ;
Et a periculis⁷ nos benignus erue.
Quia peccavimus tibi.

¹ The book gives *pandentes tibi*, which is inadmissible. We should not wonder if the true reading were *pandentes te*: the ablative, in the Mozarabic offices, being so often used for other cases.

² The book, *deposcimus*.

³ The book, *postulant*.

⁴ Who does not see that in mere prose such a collocation and such a phrase would be intolerable?

⁵ The book, *invocamus*.

⁶ Notice the *que*, which seems only inserted for the sake of the metre.

⁷ The book, *periculis*.

Now, there are several peculiarities about this singular Litany. The first, that it is undoubtedly A. B. C. Darian. We have ventured, in order to bring this out, to make one or two alterations of arrangement. In the original, the verses stand in this way:—1, 2, 6, 3, 4, 7, 8, 5. Also the 3d verse, as we give it, stands in the original:—*Assistant bona, discedant hostes*: but, as all the other verses rhyme assonantly, if not consonantly, an alteration is necessary here even on that ground only. The verse that begins with C. is lost.

MISSAL LITANY FOR THE THIRD SUNDAY IN LENT.

Rogamus te, Rex sæculorum, Deus Sancte,
Jam miserere, peccavimus tibi.

A 1. Audi clamantes, Deus altissime :
Et quæ precamur, clemens attribue :
Exaudi nos, Domine.
Jam miserere.

A 2. Bone Redemptor, supplices quæsumus,
De toto corde fientes requirimus :
Assiste propitius.
Jam miserere.

A 3. Discedant hostes, accedant bona ;
Pessima incumbent clades inopiâ :
Tu, Christe, nos libera.
Jam miserere.

A 4. Emitte manum, Deus omnipotens,
Et invocantes potenter protege
Ex alto, piissime.
Jam miserere.

A 5. Fertilitatem et pacem tribue :
Remove bella, et famem cohibe,
Redemptor sanctissime :
Jam miserere.

A 6. Gemitus vide ; fletus intellige :
Extende manum : peccantes redime
* * * * *
Jam miserere.

A 7. Hanc nostram, Deus, hanc precem suscipe :
Supplicum voces pacatus suscipe :
Et parce, piissime.
Jam miserere.

A 8. Indulge lapsis : indulge perditis :
Dimitte noxia ; ablue crimina :
Acclives tu libera
Jam miserere.

MISSAL LITANY FOR THE FOURTH SUNDAY IN LENT.

- | | |
|--|---|
| <p>A 1. A Patre missus, veni
Perditos requirere :
Et hoste captivatos
Sanguine redimere :
Plebs dira abjecit me.
<i>Miserere, Pater juste, et omnibus
indulgentiam da.</i></p> <p>A 2. Prædictus a Prophetis
Natus sum ex Virgine :
Assumpsi formam servi
Perditos colligere :
Venantes ceperunt me.
<i>Miserere.</i></p> <p>A 3. Mihi pro bonis mala
Reddita sunt plurima :
Adversum me dederunt
Iniqua consilia,
Venditum pecunia.
<i>Miserere.</i></p> <p>B. Spineam coronam
Posuerunt capiti
Sputis sordidato :
Illuserunt impij
Afflictum crudeliter.
<i>Miserere.</i></p> <p>A 4. Cum noxiis latronibus¹
Suspensum patibulo,
Amaro cibo pastum,</p> | <p>Et acerbo poculo
Traditum supplicio.
<i>Miserere..</i></p> <p>A 5. Quos veni liberare,
Hi accusaverunt me :
Flagellis verberatum
Cruci affixerunt me :
Lanceâ² percusserunt me.
<i>Miserere.</i></p> <p>A 6. Qui impio latroni
Dimisisti scelera,
Tu solve vincula³ nostra
Et relaxa crimina :
Salva nos cruce tua.
<i>Miserere.</i></p> <p>A 7. Traditus sum sepulchro :
Fregi portas inferi
Ejeci vinculatos
Et reduxi ad superos
Ostendi in victima.
<i>Miserere.</i></p> <p>C 1. Pater clementissime,
Dimitte illis noxia :
Cuncta dele peccata,
Et relaxa crimina :
Ignorant quid faciunt.
<i>Miserere.</i></p> |
|--|---|

MISSAL LITANY FOR THE FIFTH SUNDAY.

Insidiati sunt adversarii mei gratis.

Tu, Pater Sancte, miserere, et libera me.

- | | |
|--|---|
| <p>A 1. Portatus sum, ut Agnus
Innocens in Victimam.
Captus ab inimicis
Ut avis in muscipulam,
Magis gratis.
<i>Tu, Pater Sancte.</i></p> <p>A 2. Aperuerunt omnes
Ora sua contra me ;
Dentibus fremuerunt,
Quærentes deglutire me,
Magis gratis.
<i>Tu, Pater Sancte.</i></p> | <p>A 3. Sibilantes clamabant,
Et movebant capita ;
Tractantes de me falsa
Proferre testimonia,
Magis gratis.
<i>Tu, Pater Sancte.</i></p> <p>A 4. Suspensum cruci damnant
Fixum clavis ferreis :
Venditum a Judæis
Pro triginta argenteis,
Magis gratis.
<i>Tu, Pater Sancte.</i></p> |
|--|---|

¹ We have little doubt that this ought to be *latronis*, from the barbarous *latronus*.

² The last two syllables of such words coalesce in Mozarabic hymns, as in modern Portuguese and Spanish, and must be taken to do so here.

³ The book, *vincula*.

- | | |
|---|--|
| <p>A 5. In latere confossus
 Gladio horrifico:
 Illico fluit latex
 Cum sanguine innoxio,
 Magis gratis.
 <i>Tu, Pater Sancte.</i></p> | <p>A 8. Sic Judæorum turba
 Cæcâ diffidentia
 Deposcut a Pilato
 Milites pro custodia:
 Magis gratis.
 <i>Tu, Pater Sancte.</i></p> |
| <p>A 6. Omnes inundaverunt
 Quasi aquæ super me,
 Dimissum in sepulchro:
 Apposuerunt lapidem,
 Magis gratis.
 <i>Tu, Pater Sancte.</i></p> | <p>A 9. Tunc milites dividant
 Vestem meam sortibus:
 Cernentes¹ in me flagra
 Injusta et sævissima,
 Magis gratis.
 <i>Tu, Pater Sancte.</i></p> |
| <p>A 7. Confusa palluerunt
 Cuncta cœli sidera:
 Dies obtenebratur
 Cum vidit pati Dominum,
 Magis gratis.
 <i>Tu, Pater Sancte.</i></p> | <p>A 10. Intende, pie Pater,
 Et succurre miseris,
 Pro quibus tam acerbis
 Afficior suppliciis,
 Magis gratis.
 <i>Tu, Pater Sancte.</i></p> |

There is some, but a very slight and corrupted trace of these Litanies in the *Sacramentarium Gallicanum* published by Mabillon, and reprinted by Migne. Those which the Mozarabic Ritual gives for the fourth and fifth Sundays in Lent are, but in a very fragmentary state, attributed to Easter Eve.

We next come to the *Oratio super populum*, which is, in fact, the Collect for the Day, and ought to be distinguished from the² Gallican Prayer of the same name, which occurs towards the end, and is equivalent to the Benediction. There is no such collect in the Mozarabic; and this is the one great advantage, and we think the only one, which the present office has over that. Now it is very singular to compare the Milanese *Oratio super populum* with the Roman Collect. The instances in which they are the same are as follows:—The Ambrosian for feriæ in Advent is the Roman for its fourth Sunday. The prayers are identical in—First Mass at Christmas, S. Thomas of Canterbury (of course), Epiphany III., Epiphany V. In Lent (it must be remembered that there is no Ambrosian office for the Fridays) the Sundays are always different. The week-days are the same with these exceptions:—Thursday in the second and third weeks; in the fourth Tuesday and Saturday; also, the Ambrosian Thursday is

¹ For *decernentes*.

² It is odd that, in speaking of the latter, Liturgical writers do not refer to the Ambrosian use of the terms: so for example Gerbertus, *Liturg. Alemann.* Tom. i. p. 400. It is to the Gallican use, of course, that Micrologus alludes, where we find: 'Oratio post communionem pro solis communicantibus debet orari. Populus autem etsi quotidie in Quadragesima convenit, non tamen quotidie, ut deberet, communicat. Ne ergo populus ita oratione careret, adjecta est *Oratio super populum*, in qua non de communicatione, sed de populi protectione oratur specialiter.' In this sense, the Roman Missal has the *Super populum* in Lent, but in Lent only.

the Roman Friday: in Passion Week, Monday, Wednesday, Thursday, Saturday: in Holy Week, Friday, Saturday. In Easter Week, Tuesday, Wednesday, and Thursday are the same. So is the first Sunday after. The Roman third is the Milanese fourth; Trinity and the first Sunday after Pentecost are the same; three or four others of the Sundays after Trinity have the same Collects, though not in the same order. To which we may add that the Ambrosian S. Stephen is the same as the Roman Octave.

But, the same or not the same, these Collects have exactly a similar character with those to which we are accustomed; so similar, that it is not worth while to dwell at any further length on them. We proceed to the Prophecy.

The Prophecy is read on all Sundays and Festivals, but not in Ferial Masses. This also was the Gallican as well as the Mozarabic use; and a curious vestige of it was kept up in some of the French churches even in the eighteenth century. So it was at the three Masses of Christmas in the cathedrals of Vienne, Rouen, and Orleans (only at Vienne *after* the Epistle): so in the third Mass at Fontevraud, at all three at Auxerre, at all the highest festivals at Orleans; at Christmas in S. Aygnan, at Orleans; so at the Collegiate Church of Jargeau; also at Rouen S. Lo.

We give those for the first three weeks in Advent:—

	AMBROSIAN.	MOZARABIC.
Advent 1.	Isaiah li. 4—8.	Isaiah x. 33; xi. 10.
2.	Baruch iv. 36; v. 9.	Isaiah li. 7—12.
3.	Isaiah xxxv.	Isaiah li. 1—6.
4.	Isaiah xl. 1—11.	Isaiah xxiv. 16—23.
5.	Micah v. 2, 3, and Malachi iii. 1—7.	Isaiah xvi. 1—5.
6.	Isaiah lxii. 8; lxiii. 4.	Isaiah xxxv.
Christmas Day.	Isaiah ix. 1—7.	Isaiah ix. 1—7.
3d Mass.		
St. Stephen.	Acts vi. 9, 10, and vii. 54—60.	Acts vi. and vii. 51—viii. 3.
S. John Ev.	1 St. John i.	Wisdom x. 10—18.
Holy Innocents.	Jeremiah xxxi. 15—20.	Jeremiah xxxi. 15—20.
Circumcision.	Baruch vi. 1, 2.	Isaiah xlviii. 12—20.
	Jeremiah lvii. 52—54.	
	Baruch vi. 4—7.	
Sunday in the Octave.	Isaiah viii. 9—18.	Isaiah xlix. 1—6.
Epiphany.	Isaiah lx. 1—6.	Isaiah lx. 1—19.
1st Sunday after Epiph.	Isaiah lxi. 1—3, and lxii. 11, 12.	Isaiah lii. 1—10.
2d	Acts iv. 9—12.	Isaiah lxi. 17—24.
3d	Ezekiel xxxvii. 21—28.	Isaiah lxvi. 1—14.
4th	Jerem. xxxiii. 14—21.	Jeremiah xxxi. 31—34.
5th	Malachi iii. 9—12.	Jeremiah xxxi. 10—14.

	AMBROSIAN.	MOZARABIC.
6th Sunday after Epiph.	Malachi iii. 13—18.	Jeremiah iii. 29; iv. 2.
7th, or Septuagesima.	Joel ii. 12—21.	Jeremiah vii. 1—7.
8th, or Sexagesima.	Ezekiel xxxiii. 7—11.	Jeremiah xiii.
9th, or Quinquagesima.	Zachariah ix. 5—14.	Isaiah lv.
In Cap. Jejuni.		Proverbs i. 23—32.
Lent, 1st Sunday.	Isaiah lviii. 1—12.	Isaiah lv.
Monday.	Ezekiel xxxiv. 11—16.	
Tuesday.	Isaiah lv. 6—11.	
Wednesday.	Exodus xxiv. 12—18.	Prov. xiii. 22; xiv. 11.
		Exod. xxxiv. 27—35.
Thursday.	Ezekiel xviii. 1—9.	
Friday.		Eccles. xxix. 1—12.
Saturday.	<i>Epistle.</i>	Gen. xxxi. 17; xxxii. 1.
Lent, 2d Sunday.	Exodus xx. 1—24.	Gen. xli. 1—45.
Monday.	Daniel ix. 15—19.	
Tuesday.	1 Kings xvii. 8—16.	
Wednesday.	Esther xiii. 9—17.	Prov. xxvii. 23; xxviii. 10; Exod. ii. 11; iii. 15.
Thursday.	Jeremiah xvii. 5—10.	
Friday.		Wisdom xviii. 15—21.
Saturday.		Exod. xiii. 17; xiv. 14.
Lent, 3d Sunday.	Exodus xxxiv. 1—10.	Prov. xx. 17—28.
		Numb. xxii. 1; xxxiii. 10.
Monday.	2 Kings v. 1—15.	
Tuesday.	2 Kings iv. 1—7.	
Wednesday.	Exodus xx. 12—24.	Prov. xxi. 22—31.
Thursday.	Jeremiah vii. 1—7.	Judges i. 1—26.
Friday.		Eccles. ix. 1—10.
Saturday.		Judges xvi.
Lent, 4th Sunday.	Exodus xxxiv. 23—32.	Eccles. xiv. 11—19.
		1 Sam. i. 1—20.

The Prophecy is followed by the Psalmellus, a verse and response almost always taken from the Psalms, and in the same order and connexion in which they occur in the Psalter. It is frequently in fact the same as, though not theoretically agreeing with, the Roman Gradual. There is nothing that seems particularly to call for remark in this Antiphon; and we will therefore proceed to the Epistle.

Advent:—

AMBROSIAN.	MOZARABIC.	ROMAN.
1. 2 Thessal. ii. 1—14.	Rom. xv. 14—29.	Rom. xii.

It is somewhat singular to find the first epistle in Advent setting forth that the day of Christ is *not* at hand; yet, perhaps, as a warning of the terrors for which the faithful must be prepared before the Lord's coming, the Ambrosian Epistle is not ill-chosen. The appropriateness of the Mozarabic we fail to see,

though we are far too well aware of the admirable skill which has grouped that noble office, to feel any doubt that the fault is in ourselves.

AMBROSIAN.	MOZARABIC.	ROMAN.
2. Romans xv. 1—13.	Rom. xiii. 1—8.	

The Ambrosian is the same as the Roman for *its* second Sunday; the testimony of Scripture to our Lord's Advent. The Mozarabic is again difficult of comprehension, unless we say that it refers to our Lord's birth in Bethlehem as having taken place there through his parents' obedience 'to the higher powers,' and their fulfilment of the concluding clause,—'Tribute to whom tribute.'

3. Rom. xi. 25 to end.	Rom. xi. 25 to end.	Rom. xiii. 11 to end.
------------------------	---------------------	-----------------------

The Milanese and Spanish not inappropriately recite the prophecy of the restoration of Israel and the call of the Gentiles as events that must precede the final Advent. The Antiphona post Evang. of the former carries on the same train of thought, 'Prepare to meet thy God, O Israel;' and the Offertory unites the prophecy of Joel, 'There shall no strangers pass through Jerusalem any more,' with the command to Joshua, 'Arise and pass over this Jordan,'—the first entrance on the Promised Land being a type of the final return. The Roman Office most strikingly commences that Advent with the trumpet call of, 'Now it is high time to awake out of sleep.'

4. Hebrews x. 35—39.	1 Cor. xv. 23—31.	Rom. xv. 1—13.
----------------------	-------------------	----------------

The Ambrosian is singularly appropriate. 'He that shall come, will come, and will not tarry.' The Mozarabic, with its prophecy of 'Then cometh the end,' happily converts what we have been accustomed to consider an Easter, into an Advent Epistle. Of the Roman we have spoken.

5. Gal. iv. 22—31.	1 Thessal. v. 14—23.	Philipp. iv. 4—7.
--------------------	----------------------	-------------------

The parable of Agar, we imagine, is introduced to teach patience under the sufferings which the Church must endure, before the coming of the Lord shall end her sufferings for ever. The Mozarabic ends suitably with, 'Your whole spirit and soul 'and body be preserved blameless unto the coming of our Lord 'Jesus Christ,' as appropriate a close as is that of the Roman,—'The Lord is at hand.'

6. Philipp. iv. 4—9.	2 Thessal. ii. 1—14.	2 Cor. iv. 1—8.
----------------------	----------------------	-----------------

The Ambrosian gives us last Sunday's Roman Epistle,—we think, in a better position. Nothing can more fitly close the

series of Advent predictions. The Mozarabic ends with that prophecy of Antichrist with which the Ambrosian commenced, and surely more suitably placed. It is worth notice that Durandus tells us how, in his days, some churches transposed these epistles, reading that from the Corinthians on the third Sunday, that from the Philippians on the fourth. Sicardus however and Rupert give no hint of this.

The Nativity :—

AMBROSIAN.
Hebrews i. 1—8.

MOZARABIC.
Hebrews i. 1—12.

ROMAN.
Hebrews i. 1—12.

Saint Stephen :—

2 Timothy iii. 17;
iv. 8.

Acts vi. 1 to end;
and vii. 1; and
51—60.

Acts vi. 8—10;
and vii. 54—60.

The Ambrosian, relegating the account of the Protomartyr's Triumph to the Prophecy, chooses a most happy epistle, not only from the appositeness of the 'I have fought a good fight,' &c., but from the reference to S. Stephen's constant allusion to Scripture in the commencement,—'All Scripture is given,' &c., and the glance at the season of the year at its conclusion,—'all them also that love His appearing.' The Mozarabic is a better compendium of the history than the Roman; both, however, shine in comparison with the wretched arrangement of lessons and epistles in our own Prayer-book.

Saint John Evangelist :—

Rom. x. 8—15.

1 Thessal. iv. 13 to end.

Ecclus. xv. 1—6.

The Ambrosian prophecy, though not the same passage as the Roman epistle, is to the same effect; both, of course, referring to him who gathered his marvellous depth of theology by lying on the breast of the True Wisdom. The epistle seems less appropriate; it would be equally suitable for any Apostle. The Mozarabic appears of great antiquity, the 'we which are alive and remain unto the coming of the Lord, shall not prevent them that are asleep' clearly referring to the saying that went 'out among the brethren that that disciple should not die.'

Holy Innocents :—

Rom. viii. 14—21.

2 Cor. i. 3—7.

Rev. xiv. 1—5.

Both Ambrosian and Mozarabic epistles suit well enough to the sorrow of the bereaved Mothers; but how infinitely inferior to the Roman (and our own) glorious Lesson! Our and the Roman lesson from Jeremiah, forms the epistle of Milan and Toledo. Durandus, however, gives the lesson from Jeremiah as

the proper epistle; but some churches, says he, where Alleluia is sung on this day, have that from the Revelation. In the Roman Rite, however, Alleluia is only sung on the Octave, signifying the joy of the happy infants in the Eternal Octave of Beatitude. We cannot find the epistle from Jeremiah in any ancient Missal within our reach.

Circumcision :—

AMBROSIAN.
Philipp. iii. 1—8.

MOZARABIC.
Philipp. iii. 1—8.

ROMAN.
Gal. iv. 1—7.

The Ambrosian and Mozarabic dwell with propriety on the abolition of Jewish circumcision; the Roman is simply for the Octave. We do not exactly understand the Halberstadt. It gives Gal. iii. 23—iv. 1, for the epistle; and then it follows, *Epistola sequens legitur in Circumcisione Domini*.—Col. i. 23—28.

Epiphany :—

Titus ii. 11; iii. 2. Gal. iii. 27; iv. 7. Isaiah lx. 1—7.

The force of the Ambrosian lies in its commencement, ΕΠΙΦΑΝΗ γὰρ ἡ χάρις τοῦ Θεοῦ, κ. τ. λ., which would seem to give it a Greek origin. The Mozarabic refers to the Epiphany Baptism, a Spanish custom abolished by S. Damasus and S. Himerius of Tarragona; therefore the epistle is earlier than the fourth century. The Roman Epistle forms the prophecy in the others, and was the prophecy as early as the fifth century. For in one of the sermons of S. Maximus of Turin on that day (he of course belonged to the Italic province) we have this commencement :—‘ Ait Prophetarum præcipuus Isaïas, ‘sicut audistis, fratres charissimi, Illuminare, illuminare Jeru-salem.’ So it is in the lectionary of Luxeuil.

Christophory :—

Heb. xi. 13—16.

*

*

First Sunday after Epiphany :—

Ephes. iv. 23—28.

Rom. i. 1—17.

Rom. xii. 1—5.

The Mozarabic on this day begins the Epistle to the Romans, and reads on from it for five Sundays. The Luxoviense differs from all, having 1 Cor. i. 15—31. Ritualists are not well agreed as to the reason of the Roman Epistle. Durandus speaks of the ‘living sacrifice, holy, acceptable to God’ as the antitype of the Three Kings. Sicardus speaks of the joyous character of the whole office, inviting as it does to praise; but since ‘praise is unbecoming in the mouth of a sinner,’ the epistle, he says, speaks of holiness.

After Epiphany :—

	MOZARABIC.	AMBROSIAN.	ROMAN.
Second Sunday.	Rom. vi. 12—18.	1 Cor. i. 1—5.	Rom. xii. 6—16.
Third Sunday.	Rom. vi. 19—25.	Gal. v. 26 ; vi. 6.	Rom. xii. 16—21.
Fourth Sunday.	Rom. vii. 14 to end.	Col. i. 3—11.	Rom. xiii. 8—10.

It is worth while to observe that the scope of the Roman Epistles during this season, is the objective action of the law of God on the mind of man ; whereas the other two rites rather dwell on his subjective reception of it. There is a curious reading at the conclusion of the last-named Mozarabic Epistle. ‘*Infelix ego homo ; quis me liberabit de corpore mortis hujus ?*’ ‘*Gratia Dei, vita et pax : per Jesum Christum Dominum nostrum.*’

Fifth Sunday.	Rom. viii. 3—9.	Rom. xiii. 8—10.	Col. iii. 12—17.
Sixth Sunday.	1 Cor. i. 10—17.	Col. ii. 1—7.	1 Thess. i. 2 to end.

Septuagesima :—

1 Cor. ii. 10 ; iii. 6. 1 Cor. ix. 24 ; x. 4. 1 Cor. ix. 24 ; x. 5.

We must first remember that the Mozarabic has no such season as Septuagesima ; but goes on counting its Sundays from after Epiphany to the commencement of the Fast. We may doubt whether the original arrangement of the Ambrosian were not the same, and its present office simply borrowed from the Roman. It is to be observed that the Roman continues the allegory of the Apostle, taken from the games, by adding his description of the journeyings of the Jews in the wilderness, and thereby points out the identity of his argument in both cases. ‘*I keep under my body, and bring it into subjection, lest,*’ &c. ‘*For,*’ or ‘*Now,*’ (not *moreover,*) ‘*brethren, I would not that ye should be ignorant,*’ &c. He is assigning the cause why the body of a Christian should be kept in subjection, as having, like the Jews, eaten that spiritual meat and received that spiritual drink. Our reformers, tied down by their unhappy adherence to chapters, miss or neglect this connexion, and end with the conclusion of the ninth.

Sexagesima :—

1 Cor. xii. 27—xiii. 9. 1 Cor. ix. 7—12. 2 Cor. xi. 19—xii. 9.

Observe first that the Ambrosian Office is simply going through the most striking passages of the Corinthians, after having in like manner gone through the Romans. It seems difficult to understand why the description of charity, so very appropriate for the near approach of the Fast at Quinquagesima, should have been put back a Sunday by the Mozarabic. The Roman Epistle, which the Sarum follows, is simply selected on

this account, that the Station is, on that Sunday, in the Basilic of S. Paul; and to him, therefore, do the Collect and Epistle more especially point. It is almost needless to observe that our Collect, 'O God, who seest that we put not our trust in anything that we do,' is altered from the original, which concludes thus:—'Mercifully grant, that, by the intercession of the Doctor of the Gentiles, we may be defended against all adversity.' It is rather singular that in the German Missals, where there is no reason for the commemoration of S. Paul on this day, the same Collect and Epistle are always found.

Ash-Wednesday:—

MOZARABIC.
S. James i. 13—21.

AMBROSIAN.
None.

ROMAN.
Joel ii. 12—19.

It was not till the final alteration of the Mozarabic Rite by Cardinal Ximenes, that the season of Lent was extended backwards to Ash-Wednesday. Till then, it commenced, as does the Ambrosian to this day, with the First Sunday, thus containing only thirty-six days complete; the tenth part, roughly measured, of the whole year. Those who made the alteration, did it after a most clumsy fashion, changing Epistles and Gospels so as to deprive them of all appropriateness of position. The office for Ash-Wednesday is that which was, in Gotho-Hispanic times, the office for the First Sunday in Lent: the present first, the original second; the present second, the original third; the present third, the original fifth. The fourth, or *Mediante*, is as it was; the fifth is new; the sixth, or *De Traditione*, is as it was.

First Sunday in the Fast:—

2 Cor. v. 20—vi. 10.

2 Cor. vi. 1—10.

2 Cor. vi. 1—10.

We may observe that henceforth, during the Fast, the Ambrosian, like the Roman, has a special office for every day; but with this difference, that there is none for Friday. The Mozarabic, on the contrary, has no especial office except for Wednesday and Friday. Here, then, is a clear trace of the influence which the Eastern Church possessed at Milan; as we know it did in many other things, as, for example, in the festal character of Saturday. The Greek Church, as every one knows, never celebrates in Lent, except on the Saturdays, Sundays, and High Festivals; and here we find Milan doing the same on one day in each quadragesimal week. Notice this also. On the first four days of the week, the lections are, at Milan, Prophecy and Gospel, the Epistle being omitted.

First Sunday in Lent:—

2 Cor. v. 20—vi. 10.

2 Cor. vi. 1—10.

2 Cor. vi. 1—10.

This Epistle, common to the three rites, arms, says Durandus, the faithful with the four cardinal virtues; and certainly a more appropriate one could not have been selected.

Second Sunday in Lent:—

MOZARABIC.	AMBROSIAN.	ROMAN.
James ii. 14—23.	Ephesians i. 15—23.	1 Thess. iv. 1—8.

The Roman Epistle, as all the ritualists tell us, occupies this place, because when the Church begins to descend from generals to particulars, she warns her children against the sin of impurity as that which has destroyed infinitely more than any other. Hence also the selection of what otherwise seems inappropriate, the Transfiguration for the Gospel; as if she would teach us how those bodies are to be honoured and held in reverence, the future glorification of which was so miraculously manifested by our Lord. This, however, is a strictly Roman use; and the majority of other Churches read, as did the Sarum, and as we still do, the history of the Syro-Phœnician woman. In the very ancient *Capitular Evangeliorum*, published by Thomasius, this Sunday is 'vacant'—that is, had no proper office, on account of the very heavy duty of the preceding Saturday in Ordinations. Hence some, at a later time, took the preceding Thursday's Gospel, that of the Syro-Phœnician; others that of the Friday, the Transfiguration. Durandus simply says that 'in some Churches' the Transfiguration is read for the Gospel. The Mozarabic very appropriately gives us S. James's lesson on the necessity of works; and the Ambrosian not less fitly calls off our thoughts from the sufferings of the present Fast to the glory which is to be their result.

Third Sunday in Lent:—

1 S. Pet. i. 1—12.	1 Thess. ii. 20; iii. 3.	Ephes. v. 1—9.
--------------------	--------------------------	----------------

Mid-Lent Sunday:—

2 S. Pet. i. 1—9.	1 Thess. iv. 1—12.	Gal. iv. 22—31.
-------------------	--------------------	-----------------

Passion Sunday:—

1 S. John i. 1—7.	Ephes. v. 15—21.	Heb. ix. 11—15.
-------------------	------------------	-----------------

Palm Sunday:—

Gal. i. 1—12.	2 Thess. ii. 15—iii. 5.	Philipp. ii. 1—11.
---------------	-------------------------	--------------------

Of these Epistles, the two most striking to our mind are the Mozarabic for Passion and Palm Sunday, the former ending with the words which form so complete an Antiphon to the whole of Passion-tide: 'The blood of Jesus Christ His Son cleanseth us from all sin;' the latter, that anathema of S. Paul on those who should preach any other Gospel than that of the Atone-

ment, which the following week is to set forth. The Ambrosian Epistle for Palm Sunday seems at first sight utterly inappropriate. But the reason is this. The preceding Saturday is that of the Tradition of the Symbol; and although the Creed in the Milanese Church is not now actually delivered to the Catechumens, as it is in the Mozarabic, the Epistle with reference to the ancient rite begins very properly, 'Therefore, brethren, stand fast, and hold the traditions you have been taught.'

We have now said enough about the Epistle. A few words are all that we must allow ourselves on the Gospel. Those in Lent are the most deserving of our attention. The Ambrosian for the First Sunday, which, we must again repeat, is the actual commencement of their Lent, has the Gospel of the Temptation from S. Matthew. It was so originally in the Mozarabic Office, though now it is thrown back to Ash-Wednesday. The Second Sunday is in the Ambrosian called the Sunday of the Samaritan, the Gospel being that chapter in S. John. So it originally was in the Mozarabic, though now appropriated to the First Sunday. The Illation—which in the Ambrosian Rite is always called the Preface—of the two Churches is worth comparing. The Milanese runs thus:—'Through Christ our Lord. Who, that He 'might quietly teach the mystery of His humanity, sat down 'weary by the well; and besought the Samaritan woman that 'she would give Him water to drink, because He had created in 'her the gifts of faith. And He thus vouchsafed to thirst after 'her belief, that while He asked water from her, He kindled the 'fire of Divine love in her. We implore then Thy boundless 'mercy that we, despising the dark abyss of vices, and leaving 'behind us the pitcher of noxious lusts, may perpetually thirst 'for Thee, Who art the fountain of life, and the origin of all good 'things, and may please Thee by the observation of our fast.'

The Mozarabic is five times as long, but ends in the same way:—

'For Thou art our God; cast us not away from Thy face; 'but look upon us now whom Thou didst through free mercy 'create: that when Thou shalt have removed from us all the 'debt of sin, Thou mayest also render us well-pleasing in the 'sight of Thy love. That we, delivered from the abyss of the 'noxious well of misdeeds, leaving behind us the pitcher of our 'lusts, may, after the course of this life, hasten together to that 'eternal city, Jerusalem: that with all saints we may glorify 'Thy holy Name; thus saying,' &c.

Observe that the symbolism is nearly word for word the same: but that there is a singular mistake in the Mozarabic which does not exist in the Ambrosian. The woman left her pitcher, and went into the city; that is, the city Sichar, not the

city of Jerusalem, as the mystical interpretation obliges us to understand it.

The Third Sunday in Lent is called Abraham's Sunday; the Gospel being from the eighth chapter of S. John, where our LORD says, 'your father Abraham rejoiced to see My day,' &c. This Gospel does not occur in the Mozarabic.

The fourth Sunday is of the Man born Blind. This is now the Gospel for the second, and was originally for the third Sunday, in the Mozarabic. Both Illations have to do with the history: but there is no similarity between the two. Nowhere do we find a better example of the marvellous superiority of the office of Toledo to that of Milan, than here. Take the two as an example. We will not judge so poorly of the reader's discrimination as to say which is which.

'It is meet and right that we should render thanks to Thee, Holy LORD, Eternal FATHER, Omnipotent GOD, through JESUS CHRIST, Thy SON, our LORD, Who, by the illumination of His faith, has driven away the shadows of this world, and has made them to be sons of grace who were held under the just damnation of the law. Who thus came to judge the world, that they who see not might see, and that they who see might be made blind: that they who should confess in themselves the darkness of error, might receive light eternal, and so be freed from the shadows of guilt: and that they who, arrogant of their own merits, believed themselves to possess the light of righteousness, might deservedly be confounded in their own darkness: who, puffed up by their pride, and trusting in themselves, sought not the Physician to heal them. For by JESUS, who calls Himself the Door to the FATHER, they might have entered in. But since they were puffed up by their own merits, they remained for ever in their own blindness. Wherefore we, coming humbly before Thee, and putting no trust in our own deserts, lay open before Thy Altar, most holy Father, our own wounds, confess the darkness of our mistakes, manifest the secret offences of our consciences. Grant that we may find the medicine for our wounds, light for our darkness, purity for our conscience. With all our endeavours we desire to behold Thy face; but we are blinded and hindered by the darkness to which we are accustomed. We wish to look at the heavens and cannot; while darkened by the night of sin we cannot look to those who, on account of the holiness of their lives, deserve to be called heavens. Help us, therefore, O JESUS, as we pray in Thy Temple, [a reference to the Blind Man having been found in the Temple by our LORD,] and cure us all in this day, who wouldst not that there should be rest on the Sabbath from the working of miracles. Behold, we expose our wounds in the presence of the glory of Thy Name: do Thou bestow on our infirmities the medicine they need. Succour us as Thou hast promised while we persist, Who out of nothing hast caused that we should exist. Make plain, and anoint the eyes of our hearts and bodies; lest, through our blindness, we should fall in the dark. Behold, we wash Thy feet with our tears; send us not empty away. O good JESUS, let us not depart from Thy footsteps; Thou who didst come in Thy humility in this world. Hear the prayer of us all, and grant that we may behold the glory of Thy countenance in that beatitude of eternal peace, crying, and thus saying.'

The other Preface is as follows:—

'It is meet and salutary that to Thee, O LORD, who dwellest in the exalted citadel of the heavens, we should render thanks and should confess Thee with all our powers. For that by Thee the blindness of the world hath been removed, and true light hath shone on the weak : when among the other miracles of Thy many marvellous deeds Thou didst bid the man born blind to receive sight ; in whom the human race, maculate with original blindness, is typified by a symbol of the future. For that pool of Siloam to which that blind man was sent, is nothing else but the holy and sealed fountain, where not only the bodily eyes, but the whole man is healed, through CHRIST our LORD.'

The Fifth Sunday in Lent, which was also called, from a reason which has not been explained, the *Dominica post Vigessimam*. In the Mozarabic Missal it is the Gospel for the original fourth, the present third, Sunday. In most other churches it is read on Friday of the fourth week, or else on Saturday of Passion Week, the day when Lazarus was actually raised. The Gospel for Palm Sunday is S. John's account of the anointing of our LORD's feet by Mary Magdalene. The arrangement of the Gospels for Holy, or, as they call it, Authentic Week, is different in the Milanese books from any other. The Passion is not read at length till the Thursday. On Monday, the Gospel is S. Luke xxi. 34—38. On Tuesday, S. John xi. 47—54. On Wednesday, S. Matthew xxvi. 1—4.

One very curious Gospel it will be unpardonable not to mention. For S. Stephen's Day, in the Roman Rite, we have the prophecy from S. Matthew, also read in our own Prayer Book, of Jerusalem that killed the prophets, and stoned them that were sent into her. In the Mozarabic the selection is the same. Both highly orthodox and edifying : nothing in the world to be objected to either. But now, notice the Ambrosian. After reading for the prophecy the account of S. Stephen's martyrdom, (for *its* prophecy the Mozarabic has a lection from Wisdom,) for its epistle, 2 Timothy iv. 1—8, with reference to the 'I have fought a good fight, I have finished my course,' of the Apostle, the Gospel contains the last five verses of the seventeenth chapter of S. Matthew ; the account of the demand made on S. Peter for tribute-money, and the miraculous way in which the fisher of men was instructed to meet it. Why ? Because, in 'the fish that first cometh up,' we have a symbolical representation of S. Stephen : fishes, according to the well-known and most ancient interpretation, symbolising Christians ; and he coming up the first, with his offering out of the great sea of this world,—an offering itself stamped with the image of the King.

It would be unpardonable not to allude to the service on Easter Eve. That most noble of anthems, the *Exultet jam Angelica turba*, is the same in the Ambrosian as it is in the Roman service, down to the *Sursum Corda*. It then continues

thus: and it would hardly be possible to find, in any church, a more rapturous piece of devotion.

'It is meet and right, just and salutary, that we should always, here and everywhere, render thanks to Thee, holy LORD, Almighty FATHER, Eternal GOD. Who didst Thyself dedicate the Passover of all people, not by the blood and fat of oxen, but by the Body and Blood of Thine Only-Begotten SON JESUS CHRIST, that the sacrificial rites of an ungrateful nation having been terminated, grace might succeed to the law, and One Victim, offered by Himself once for all to Thy Majesty, might expiate the sins of the whole world. This is the Lamb, prefigured in the tablets of stone; not lost from the flock, but exiled from heaven; not lacking a shepherd, but the Good Shepherd Himself, who laid down His life for His sheep, and took it again, that to us His divine condescension might manifest His humility, and the Resurrection of His Body might confirm our hope. Who before His shearer uttered no querulous complaint, but proclaimed the oracle of the Gospel, saying: Henceforth ye shall see the SON of MAN, sitting at the Right Hand of Majesty. May He both reconcile Thee to us, O Omnipotent FATHER,¹ and endued with like majesty as Thyself, may He pardon us. For the things which happened to the Fathers in type, the same have been wrought out to us in very deed. [*The great Easter taper is lighted.*] Behold now the fiery column shines forth which preceded the people of the LORD, during the season of this blessed night, to those salutary floods in which the persecutor is overwhelmed, and the people of CHRIST emerges at liberty. For he that through Adam was delivered to death, conceived by the water on which the HOLY GHOST hath brooded, is regenerated by CHRIST to life. Let us then put an end to our voluntary fast, because CHRIST our Passover is sacrificed for us; and let us not only banquet on the flesh of the Lamb, but let us be inebriated with His Blood. For the Blood of this Lamb alone createth not guilt to them that drink it, but salvation. Let us feast on Him the unleavened bread, since man liveth not by bread alone, but by every word of GOD. For this is the bread which cometh down from heaven, far more excellent than that fruitful shower of ancient manna, on which Israel then feasted, and yet nevertheless perished. He who feedeth on This Body shall be the possessor of life eternal. Behold, old things have passed away, all things are become new. The edge of Mosaic circumcision is blunted, and the sharp stones of Josbua the son of Nun have become obsolete; the people of CHRIST is marked in the forehead, not in the loins; by a laver, not by a wound. [*The Deacon fixes the five grains of incense on the Paschal taper.*] In this Advent, then, of the evening resurrection of our LORD and Saviour, it is meet that we should burn our oblation of wax with its whiteness in appearance, its sweetness in odour, its lighted brilliancy to the eye. What more fitting, what more joyous, than that with torches wreathed with flowers we should keep watch for the flower of Jesse? Especially when wisdom hath prophesied concerning herself: I am the flower of the field, and the lily of the valleys. These waxen tapers the burnt pine sweats not forth, nor doth the cedar, wounded by the axe, weep out: but they have a hidden and symbolical teaching regarding virginity, and grow white by the transfiguration of their snowy candour. Let us wait, then, for the coming of the Spouse, as befits the Church, with lighted torches: let us render thanks by our devotion for the gift of sanctity already bestowed on us.'

¹ Notice here the 'unscriptural' expression, which also occurs more than once in the Clementine Liturgy, of reconciling God to us. According to S. Paul's teaching, it is we who are to be reconciled to God.

We must not dwell at greater length on this remarkable address, manifestly coeval with S. Augustine. There are some few expressions in it which a more correct taste has not improperly removed; but to do away with the whole hymn for the sake of them, is on a par with the treatment which Rome has bestowed on many other compositions of equal merit and antiquity.

We have already remarked that the Gospel in the Ambrosian Rite is followed by an *Antiphona post Evangelium*, which, therefore, answers to the *Lauda* of the Mozarabic ritual. There is nothing which calls for much observation in this Antiphon. It is almost always taken from the Psalms: occasionally, on Saints' Days, it is formed from the words of the Saint then commemorated. But when we come to the subsequent part of the service it is that we are painfully conscious of the infinite superiority of Toledo to Milan. In the Mozarabic Missal we have, after the Gospel, nine varying prayers or addresses, for they are as often exhortations to the people as supplications to GOD. They are—(1.) The Missa. (2.) The Alia Oratio. (3.) The Post Nomina. (4.) The Ad Pacem. (5.) The Illation. (6.) The Post Sanctus. (7.) The Post Pridie. (8.) The Prayer before the LORD's Prayer. (9.) The Benediction. And this is exclusive of the Sacrifice, the Ad Accedentes, the Ad Confractionem, and the Communio. In the Ambrosian Rite we have only four prayers posterior to the Gospel, and these far shorter than those we have been noticing. They are—(1.) The Prayer Super Sindonem. (2.) The Super Oblatam. (3.) The Preface. (4.) The Post Communione. Besides this, we have the three anthems: the Offertory, the Transitory, and the Confractory.

The Offertory is remarkable on the following account;—The Church of Milan is the only one in Christendom where the primitive custom of the people's offering the oblations is still kept up. Mr. Webb, in his *Sketches of Continental Ecclesiology*, thus describes the practice:—'After the sermon, some members of a confraternity or Bedesmen, two men and two women, in black and white mantles, brought in an oblation of the elements. They stood at the end of the choir, and the deacon came, with much ceremony, to receive the offerings.' But these 'Bedesmen' are pensioners of the Metropolitan Church itself, and are, therefore, after all, only an imitation of the venerable custom which they professed to represent. There are ten old men, called *Vecchioni*, and as many old women: two of the former, first covering their hands with *favoni*, that is, with napkins of a peculiar texture, make their oblation of bread in the right, of wine in the left; then two women do the same. These pensioners have the right of walking in processions, when they carry

the so-called cope and discipline of S. Ambrose. Landulph, the mediæval historian of Milan, describes at great length their office and character: Beroldus, also, though not without some mistakes, does the same. It is this which gives its chief interest to the Offertory. The rite itself, taking it altogether, is not remarkably striking: there is one part which, to unaccustomed eyes, seems singularly awkward: when the Deacon and Sub-deacon stand respectively at the north and south ends of the altar, like two clergymen in a badly-performed English Communion Office. In fact, of the five great living rites, for dignity and majesty, we should place the Ambrosian last. To our mind, the Armenian stands by far the first: next to that, but at some distance, we should place the Mozarabic, then the Roman, then the orthodox Eastern, and then, far below this, the Ambrosian.

The *Oratio super Sindonem* bears far more the character of a Roman collect than of the longer Mozarabic or Eastern prayers. In fact, sometimes it is the same as the Collect for the day in the Petrine Liturgy: and whether or not, the shortness of the whole composition, and the terseness and antithetical arrangement of its members, stamp it with the same character. The *Oratio post Communionem*, in like manner, bears the character of the Roman Post-Communio, as also does the *Oratio super Oblatam* of the Roman *Secreta*. One remarkable peculiarity, derived from the most remote antiquity, we should not fail to mention: that, on the Epiphany, immediately after the Gospel, but before the *Antiphona post Evangelium*, the Deacon sings the notice of the ensuing Easter to a peculiar melody, in the Eighth Tone, and in the following words:—‘*Noverit caritas vestra, fratres carissimi, quod annuente Dei et Domini nostri JESU CHRISTI misericordia, die N. Mensis N. Pascha Domini cum gaudio celebrabimus.*’ And the answer is, ‘*Deo gratias.*’

Take now one or two examples of Ambrosian *Illations*: and we will select one which we may compare not alone with the Mozarabic, but also with the Gallican. Here is that for Holy Innocents.

Ambrosian :—

‘It is just and salutary that we, Holy, Omnipotent FATHER, should more gloriously laud Thee in the precious death of the little ones: whom, on account of the infancy of Thy Son, our LORD and Saviour, gloomy Herod slew with savage cruelty: and we acknowledge the unbounded gifts of Thy clemency. For Grace alone shines more gloriously than Will; and their confession was illustrious before their voices could be heard. Passion, before the limbs in which that passion could exist: they witnessed CHRIST to others, who as yet knew Him not themselves. O Infinite loving-kindness of the Almighty: when He suffereth not those that were slain for His Name, although they knew it not, to fall short of the merit of eternal glory: but, when they were bedewed with their own blood, they

obtained at once the salvation of regeneration, and were glorified with the Crown of Martyrdom. 'Through the same.'

Gallican :—

'It is verily meet and right that we should at all times and in all places render thanks to Thee, Holy LORD, Omnipotent FATHER, Eternal GOD, and chiefly for those, the memory of whose Passion we celebrate in the yearly festival of to-day: those whom the Herodian soldiers dashed from the breasts of their nursing mothers, who of a truth are called the flowers of martyrs, for that they, springing up in the mid-winter of infidelity, were like the first budding gems of the Church, nipped by the frost of persecution, at that glittering fountain in the city of Bethlehem. For the Infants, who could not, through their age, speak, nevertheless resounded the praise of the LORD with joy. They preached that by their deaths, which they could not have preached by their lives. They uttered that with their blood which they could not proclaim by their tongue. Martyrdom gave them the power of praise, to whom infancy had not yet allowed the faculty of utterance. The Infant CHRIST sends these infants as first-fruits to heaven, transmits these new year's gifts to the FATHER: exhibits to the Eternal One the first martyrdoms of the little children perpetrated by the wickedness of Herod, as firstling oblations. The enemy profits, while injuring, the body: bestows a benefit by means of slaughter: by dying they live, by falling they rise again: victory is brought to pass by means of destruction. Wherefore for these benefits, and for the present solemnity, tendering, rather than repaying, boundless thanks to Thy loving-kindness, with holy Angels and Archangels, we laud Thee, as the One GOD, the Ruler, distinct, not divided, triune, not threefold, sole, not solitary, saying, Holy.

Mozarabic :—

'It is meet and right that we should always render thanks to Thee, Almighty FATHER, and to JESUS CHRIST our LORD, the infancy of whose assumed humanity that wicked and profane king feared after such a sort that he was compelled to tremble at that power whom he merited not to acknowledge. Desiring that He specially should perish, and ignorant where He was to be found, Herod commanded that all the infants should be slain: if perchance, while the members were struck, the Head might be reached: and the deaths of the poor might be the structure which should be topped by the royal death. Thus the madness of deceived fury made those martyrs by death, who by their age were not capable of being even confessors. And when there was no possibility of judgment, there was, nevertheless, the felicity of being unjustly judged for CHRIST's sake. It was CHRIST, then, whom the hand of the officer struck in the dying infants: ignorance found not Him Whom it saw; and imprudence discerned not Him Whom it struck. But that these infants could not speak is no derogation from their praise. For it is better that the cause should cry out, than that the tongue should exclaim. Nor does it matter that speech failed them, who, without all manner of doubt, perished for the Word. O immanity of wicked fury! He who was slain, was carried on the sword that killed him, and the tender corpse hung on the hilt, pouring forth milk rather than blood. And they who could not then discern that for which they thirsted, now possess in joy that from which they may drink. Whence meetly to Thee, O LORD, all the Angels cease not to exclaim, thus saying: Holy.'

It would be easy to extend our remarks on these Illations; but our space warns us to conclude. The two anthems called the Transitory and the Confractory present but little for our

special notice. As a general rule, they are connected with the Gospel for the Sunday: and the same are usually said through the week. In some cases, the Transitory is merely a translation of some Greek Troparion; another proof of the closeness of the link by which Milan was joined to the East. Take this, for example, for Quinquagesima: it is neither more nor less than a translation of a Stichos in the Sunday of the Pharisee and Publican:—

‘Come and be converted to Me, saith the LORD. Come ye with weeping, and let us pour forth our tears to GOD: for we have forsaken Him, and because of us the earth suffers; we have committed iniquity, and for our sakes the foundations of the world are moved. Let us hasten to prevent the anger of GOD, weeping, and saying: Thou That takest away the sins of the world, have mercy upon us.’

Sometimes it is a mere quotation from the writings of S. Ambrose, as in the Sunday of Abraham: ‘Look, O Lord, at the frailty of the human race, and seek out the wounds which Thou hast cured. For, however great be the love that Thou hast poured out upon us, there are yet further mercies which Thou mayest bestow upon us. Stretch forth, we beseech Thee, Thy medicinal hands, and cure that which is weak, and repair that which is tottering, and preserve that whole where faith remains unshaken.’ In some few cases the Transitory seems to be composed for the occasion, as in the Sixth Sunday after Epiphany:—‘Turn ye, O ye sons of men, while ye have time, saith the Lord; and I will write your names in the book of My Father which is in heaven.’

The *Oratio Post Communionem*, answering to the Latin Post-Communion, often identical with it, is the only other prayer which has to be noticed. That over, the office ends thus:—

V. The LORD be with you.
R. And with thy spirit. Kyr. Kyr. Kyr.
V. The LORD bless and hear us.
R. Amen.
V. Let us go on in peace.
R. In the NAME of the LORD. Amen.

And the service now borrows the Roman ending from the first chapter of S. John.

At Christmas, and at Easter and Pentecost, there are two sets of masses; one for the recently baptized in the winter Church, the other the ordinary solemnity. Much that was peculiar to the Ambrosian Rite disappeared during the Pontificate of S. Charles Borromeo, who did almost as much harm to the ritual as he increased the piety of his Church. Till his time, that noble Basilic, which may put in a claim to be the finest of

all temples made with hands, had but one altar: it was he who filled it up with the erections which now so sadly violate the magnificent unity of the effect.

Thus we have gone through the three great Rites of the Western Church. Of these the Ambrosian seems to us the poorest, inferior to the marvellous copiousness and richness and variety of the Mozarabic, inferior to the terseness and pointed brevity of the Roman. Such as it is, however, it is well worthy of study; and, as we have seen, one or two of its formulæ possess an antiquity superior to that which can be boasted by any other ritual.

ART. V.—*L'Union Chrétienne. Journal Hebdomadaire, paraissant tous les dimanches. Bureaux de Rédaction et d'Administration, 5, Rue Coq-Héron, Paris.*

WE desire to call attention to this new effort of the Gallican party in Paris. We have already more than once noticed the *Observateur Catholique*, which is *par excellence* the Gallican periodical organ. This journal is still continuing on its useful course, and has lately contained a series of papers very interesting to English readers, being a review of the French translation of Mr. Massingberd's History of the Reformation, written by the learned and candid author of the *Histoire de l'Eglise de France*, the Abbé Guettée. The present journal is conducted on the same principles as the *Observateur Catholique*, but with a different purpose. The object of the *Observateur Catholique* is, we presume, to maintain the old traditions of the French Church, as represented by Bossuet, against the flood of Ultramontane innovation which is everywhere striving to remove its neighbours' and its ancestors' landmarks, and to reduce everything to a dead uniformity with Rome. The object of the *Union Chrétienne* shall be stated in its own words. The following is the prospectus issued by the Editors:—

'The founders of this new religious journal belong to different Christian Communions, but they are united in the same worship of the Word of God and in the same love for the Church of Christ.

'Deeply afflicted at the schism which exists between the different branches of the Church, and at the misapprehensions, mistakes, and prejudices which keep up this division, we propose to ourselves the task of removing these mistakes, prejudices, and misapprehensions, and of preparing the way for a holy union amongst all those who bear the name of Christian.

'This work of peace cannot but receive the blessing of HIM who died for the purpose of abolishing all divisions among men, and of uniting minds in truth and hearts in charity.

'We think that the best way of arriving at our object will be to disentangle revealed religious truth from everything which is not revealed, by means of study and discussion on the Holy Scriptures and on the works which remain to us of the first Christian ages. We must in this way arrive at the Apostolical teaching, such as it was accepted by all the branches of the Christian Church previous to their separation.

'We feel sure that merely presenting the doctrine of Jesus Christ thus, in its *purity and integrity*, will be enough to attach to it the affections of all honest-hearted Christians.

'There are, thank God, very many such Christians, but they find themselves isolated,—lost as it were in the midst of the indifferent mass which constitutes the majority of men in all Churches. We know that they are anxious for an organ to serve as a centre and bond of union.

' We desire to answer to their wishes in founding the *Union Chrétienne*.

' There will be published in it learned and grave articles on all questions of interest to religious men; our readers will be kept *au courant* with the theological, historical, and philosophical discussions which are agitated in the bosom of the several Churches; special attention will be paid to the questions which have brought about the separation of these Churches; everything which takes place connected with religion, that is worthy of notice, will be registered. The ruling idea, as we have said, throughout, will be that of disentangling revealed religious truth from all systems of men, the doctrines of Christ from the opinions and prejudices which are too often confounded with them.

' We invite all of our brethren in Jesus Christ, who, like ourselves, aspire to union, to take part in this work. We shall not be exclusive. We shall accept with sympathy everything addressed to us which is written in an earnest spirit. We wish our journal to be as a centre where all the rays of mind which are enlightened by faith converge.

' By means of the communications which we shall receive from the most intelligent members of the different Christian Churches, a better understanding will be come to about the disputes which have served as the excuse for their separation. Misunderstandings will disappear by little and little; questions will take their place better; light will fall of itself on the flock of the Lord. From thence will follow a work of unity, the stronger and more irresistible that it will be from within and unintermittent, and will owe nothing to diplomatic talent.

' Those who desire to support us with their sympathies may rest assured that the new religious journal which we are founding will never be allowed to become a speculation, but will always show itself worthy of their support by the firm attitude which it will assume, by its fairness, and by its high-minded independence.'¹

This prospectus speaks for itself. We see nothing in it which an English Churchman might not have written, and nothing in which an English Churchman may not heartily sympathise. It is charitable and fair-spoken. There is no arrogance about it—no assumption. It in effect acknowledges that the Pope is not the centre of unity to the Church, nor the means of gathering divided Christians into unity. Its appeal is to Holy Scripture and antiquity. It shows, indeed, that it is but a narrow (though, alas! a deep) channel which parts the Gallican from the Anglican Churchman.

The introductory article in the first number is written in the same spirit as the prospectus. It is headed 'General Considerations on the object which the founders of the *Union Chrétienne* place before themselves.' We cannot better explain the purpose of the proposed movement than by quoting largely from this article.

¹ To this prospectus there is added a note to the effect that the *Union Chrétienne* will appear weekly, beginning on the 6th of November last, and that persons desirous of subscribing should write to *M. le Directeur de l'Union Chrétienne, 5, Rue Coq-Héron, Paris*. The price to subscribers in England, including postage, is thirty francs, or twenty-five shillings for the year, payable through a banker or a bookseller, or in any other way.

'The *Union Chrétienne* has been founded to serve as a centre and organ for true Christians, who wish to labour in the work of bringing about Religious Unity, which our Lord Jesus Christ came to found on the earth.

'This unity did exist in the first ages of Christianity, but since the separation of the Churches that community of belief and opinion, which in the purpose of our Lord and Master ought to be the final result of His teaching and sacrifice, has been no longer seen.

'The Christian world is not united; discord, antipathy, and hatred reign between the different Christian Churches. Even in those communions which boast most of their unity, one sees an almost infinite number of sectaries, who form parties, or, if you will, schools. These schools differ on the most fundamental questions; they do not observe any rules of charity towards each other; so that they are really as much divided as the different Churches themselves.

'But over and above the sectaries and the partisans, in every Church there are found men deeply religious, wise, and learned, who groan over the discords of which the Christian world is the theatre, and aspire after the blessed time when the prayer of the Lord will be accomplished:—

"'Holy Father," said the Saviour, on the eve of quitting the world, "Holy Father, I pray not for these alone, but for those who shall believe on Me through their word, that they all may be *one*, as Thou, Father, art in Me and I in Thee, that they also may be *one* in Us, that the world may believe that Thou hast sent Me." (John xvii. 21.)

'Thus union between Christians is the sign which Christ gives of his divine mission. It is by means of it that the work of revelation and redemption is to be accomplished; it is this union which was predicted by the angels of the Lord when they announced the birth of the Man-God—"Glory to God in the highest! Peace upon earth; goodwill amongst men." (Luke ii. 14.)¹

'To labour for peace and union is therefore to take part in a divine work.

'Members of different Christian Churches, who are convinced of this truth and united in sentiment, have undertaken to concentrate their efforts with a view to bringing together those who believe in Christ; to do away with the barriers which keep apart so many men who deserve to understand each other, and ought no longer to be the victims of error or prejudice.

'To reach this end they have chosen as the first means the foundation of a journal specially intended to discuss the questions which at present divide Christian Churches, and to expound religious truth with exactness and precision as it has been revealed.

'One of the principal obstacles to union is the different sense attached by different persons to the word *Church*. We shall take particular care in our examination of this preliminary question. . . .

'The word *Catholic* has been tortured into every kind of meaning. The only sense which the ancient Christian Church assigned to it is that of S. Pacian. The *Catholic* then is the *Complete Christian*. To be a Catholic and to belong to the true Church of Christ, it is enough to accept revealed religious truth without taking away from it or adding thereto, such as it was accepted by the Apostolic and Universal Church.

'Those who add to this revealed truth or diminish from it are not Catholics, to whatever Church they may belong. Those who accept it in its purity are Catholics and children of the true Church of Christ, in whatever ecclesiastical communion they have been born.

¹ This text and that of S. John, just quoted, are adopted as the mottoes of the *Union Chrétienne*.

'Diversities in Churches cannot be barriers to the union of the children of God. They belong to the circumstances and manners of different peoples and times. Provided that the variety which results therefrom is not injurious either to morality or to the faith or to the essential constitution of the Church, it ought to be all the more respected, because without it the very establishment of Christianity would for some countries be altogether impossible, and the unity of the Church would be a Utopia.

'Those, then, who accept in its completeness the doctrine of Christ are *Catholics* and true Christians, however much they may differ with respect to ceremonies, which are dependent on the character of different nations. What matters the form, so that the foundation is the same? The foundation is divine, the form is human. To confound them together is to make a heterogeneous mixture of the divine and the human, to raise insuperable barriers between man and man, and to render the work of Christ impossible.

'To distinguish that which comes from God from that which has been established by men, our rule will be Holy Scripture studied, examined, and interpreted in an honest and candid spirit. When the doctrinal meaning of a text is called in question, we shall prefer to our own judgment the interpretation of the Church, such as it will be shown to be from the concurrent witness of all the Apostolic Churches. That is the rule which was in use from the beginning of Christianity. We cannot employ this rule of the Catholic Faith without meeting with two sorts of adversaries.' . . .

These adversaries are explained to be the Individualists on one side, who do not sufficiently regard the *croissance collective* and the *témoignage permanent et universel* of the Church; and on the other the Absolutists, who dishonour the principle of authority by confounding it with blind submission, and in whose eyes annihilation of the intellect is the generation of order and faith—in other words, the Ultramontanists, whom the writer expects to find his bitterest foes and calumniators.

The following passage in the same paper is worthy of notice:—

'We shall examine into the origin and reason of the Papal Power by the help of the monuments of ecclesiastical history and ecclesiastical law. In reducing this power to its *legal and canonical* bounds, we shall destroy one of the greatest obstacles to the union of the Christian Churches, one of the most direct causes of the internal divisions which exist amongst Christians.'
—P. 3.

The writer continues to repudiate, on the part of himself and his *collaborateurs*, the thought of setting up altar against altar, or instituting a new Church. He re-affirms that their object is to spread abroad the good seeds of revealed religious Truth, pure from all human accretion and in its fulness: that they address themselves to religious and honest-hearted men who are anxious to possess the Truth of Christ in its completeness; that they wish to confirm those who are in possession of this Truth, to enlighten those who are deceived, to receive enlightenment themselves, to offer the friends of Truth a means of communicating with each other, east speaking through their columns to west, and north to south: and a promise is given that all communications shall be admitted which are worthy of publication.

We must make one more extract from this manifesto, long as our quotations have already been :—

‘It cannot be concealed that everywhere men feel the need of religious union. In all Christian Churches we see a work of fusion going on, or rather an attempt at it. But these efforts are not crowned with success.

‘In the Roman Church those who are working for unity confound unity with uniformity. . . .

‘The Greek Church, so venerable in many respects in spite of too strong a tendency towards subtle and scholastic discussions, has been by unhappy circumstances subjected to the yoke of Islam, and has undergone the sad consequences of slavery. Sound in its faith, it has fallen with respect to its institutions into a kind of *atonie*, which necessarily follows from slavery. Almost isolated from the Occidental Churches, prejudiced against some Oriental Churches, she has not found in herself the elements of active life and intellectual progress. Russia, which belongs to this ancient Church, seems to be called by Providence to make her belief known and to stimulate her religious activity. . . .

‘Protestantism seeks to group its scattered members in an Evangelical Alliance, and even opens the gate of this Alliance to the members of other Churches. But the different branches of Protestantism are divided amongst themselves, and from the other Christian Churches, on too many important points for them to be able to be really united in the maintenance of all their special doctrines.

‘The Anglican Church, so important for the number of its children, and for the learned labours of its theologians, feels, like all the rest, the need of union; and at the same time finds itself deeply divided. While one portion of its clergy manifests tendencies towards the Roman Church, the other throws itself back into Protestantism. All desire to be united in the Truth, and they are more divided than ever.

‘Everywhere we see internal quarrels arising from tendencies to union in different forms.’—P. 5.

With these and other like words the Abbé Guettée, who signs himself *Prêtre de l'Eglise Catholique, du rite latin*, launches forth the first number of the new periodical in the name of the committee of management. He is followed by Ab-Youssouf, who designates himself as *Prêtre de l'Eglise Catholique, du rite oriental*, in a paper written in the same spirit and declaring the work of the journal to be that of ‘sowing in the world the good seed of union in charity and truth.’ The rest of the number is taken up by a *Chronique* of religious events, and by a short article declaring that while the first object of the Editors is to work for the union of the Churches by theological and historical discussions of religious questions, they shall, in addition, employ themselves in defending Christianity against the attacks directed against it by Deism and Rationalism in the philosophical writings of the day.

This last announcement is important, as showing the spirit in which the work is conducted. The movement is no product of French Liberalism desirous of casting off Christian Truth, or secretly doubting whether Truth exists. It does not spring

from a hope of combining in negatives, but of uniting in positive Christian Truth. Our eyes have long watched for such a movement, and have grown weary in watching. God grant that it may prosper now!

We shall not detail the contents of the other eight numbers which have appeared up to the date of our publication with the same minuteness. The following are the headings of some of the articles:—‘Principles of Christian Union’ (p. 9), ‘On Christian Tolerance’ (p. 11), ‘The results of quarrels within the Church’ (p. 17), ‘The Armenian Church’¹ (p. 20), ‘Is

¹ The French, who, on political motives, are the strongest possible Roman Catholic Propagandists in the East, have been striving for a length of time to bring over the Armenians to the Latin Communion by offering them French protection and temporal advantages on their compliance. They have partially succeeded. On the other hand another part of the Armenian Church looks back to the Orthodox Church with more friendly eyes than heretofore. In one of the last copies of the *Armenian Punch* (for there is an *Armenian* ‘*Punch*’) there appeared an illustration representing the struggle which has been going on in the district of Karpout, between the National Armenians and the Romanists. On the left there is a church-door marked Armenia; on the right another marked Rome. In the centre there is a parcel of children in a swing or basket, which is oscillating between the two doors. At each door there are priests with outstretched hands, and at the bottom there is written, ‘We shall soon see who will catch the cords of the swing.’ The faces of the Romanist priests are beaming with eagerness and confidence; those of the National Armenian priests marked with ineffable disgust and chagrin. The following extract from the *Byzantis*, the Orthodox Greek Church newspaper, published at Constantinople, of the date of November 11th last, will be interesting to our readers as showing the approximation of the Orthodox and Armenian Communions:—

Τὴν παρελθούσαν δευτέραν ἡ Α. Μακ. ὁ πατριάρχης τῶν Ἀρμενίων Κ. Κιβόρκ μετέβη μετὰ πολλῆς συνοδείας καὶ παρατάξεως εἰς τὰ ἡμέτερα Πατριαρχεῖα πρὸς ἐπίσκεψιν τῆς Α. Π. τοῦ Πατριάρχου. Ἡ Α. Π. μετὰ τῆς ἱερᾶς Συνόδου ἐδέχθη τὰς Α. Μ. εἰς τὴν θύραν τῶν Συνοδικῶν ὅπου ἔκαμον τὸν ἐν Χριστῷ ἀσπασμὸν, μετὰ δὲ ταῦτα ἐγένοντο εἰς τὴν Α. Μ. αἱ δέουσαι περιποιήσεις, καὶ μετὰ συνδιαλέξιν διαρκέσασαν ἐπὶ ἱκανὴν ὥραν, ἀναχωρῶν ἡ Α. Μ. ὁ πατριάρχης Κύριος Κιβόρκ κατέβη εἰς τὸν πατριαρχικὸν ναὸν, προπορευομένων τῶν ἡμετέρων ἱερέων ἐν στολῇ, ὅπου τοὺς ὑπεδέχθησαν διὰ τοῦ “ἄξιον ἐστίν.” Ἀκολουθῶς εἰσελθὼν ἡσπάσθη τὰς ἁγίας εἰκόνας καὶ τὸ λείψανον τῆς ἁγίας Εὐφροσύνης καὶ ἁγίας Θεοφανοῦς, μεθ’ ἧς ἡ Α. Μ. προσελθούσα εἰς τὰ δημόθια ἔκαμεν αἰτησὶν ἀρμενιστῇ, οἱ δὲ ψάλλται ἔψαλον τὸ “εἰς πολλὰ ἔτη Δέσποτα,” καὶ ἡ Α. Μ. ὑλόγησε τοὺς περιστώτας. Μετὰ ταῦτα ἡ Α. Μ. ἀπῆλθε διὰ τῆς αὐτῆς καὶ πάλιν παρατάξεως.

Ἡ φαινόμενη καλὴ ἀρμονία μεταξὺ τῶν ἀρχηγῶν τῶν δύο Ἐκκλησιῶν θεωρεῖται παρ’ ἀμφοτέρων τῶν ἐθνῶν μετὰ πλείστης εὐαρεσκείας. Πολλὰς γὰρ τῶν ἐθνικῶν ἐγένοντο ἀπόπειραι ἐκ μέρους τῶν Ἀρμενίων πρὸς ἔνωσιν τῶν δύο Ἐκκλησιῶν, αἵτινες δὲν διαφέρουσιν οὔτε κατὰ τὰ δόγματα οὔτε κατὰ τὰς θρησκευτικὰς δοξασίας. Αἱ πρὸ ἐτῶν γενόμεναι ἀπόπειραι αὗται ἀπέτυχον δυστυχῶς ὥστε ἔνεκα ὑπερμέτρου θρησκευτικοῦ ζήλου τῶν ἡμετέρων, οἷτινες δεικνύουσιν ἐπιμονὴν εἰς μερικότητάς τινας ἀσημάτων. Τοιοῦτοτρόπως δὲν ἀναγνωρίζει ἡ ἡμετέρα Ἐκκλησία τὸ βάπτισμα τῶν Ἀρμενίων, μολονόν γίνεται κατὰ τὸν αὐτὸν τρόπον, ὅπως διατάττουν οἱ ἱεροὶ κανόνες.

Εὐχρῆς ἔργον ἤθελεν εἶσθαι ἀμφοτέραις αἱ ἐκκλησίαι νὰ ἔλθωσιν εἰς εὐλόγους παραχωρήσεις καὶ νὰ φέρωσιν εἰς ἔνωσιν τὰς δύο ἐκκλησίας, μεταξὺ τῶν ὁποίων οὐδεμία ὑπάρχει δογματικὴ ἢ κανονικὴ διαφορά, καὶ εἰς ἣν ἀνηκούσι δύο ἔθνη τὰ πολυπληθέστερα καὶ τὰ μᾶλλον ἀνεπτυγμένα ἠθικῶς τε καὶ ὑλικῶς ἐνὸς καὶ τοῦ

'the present a favourable time for the Union of all Christians?' (p. 25), 'Some Counsels of Christian Charity for the Union of the Churches' (p. 28), 'Protestant Propaganda in Italy' (p. 30), 'On the Church of Christ' (p. 33), 'On the Study of Holy Scripture, and especially of the New Testament, as a means of Reformation and Union' (p. 35). The signatures generally given are those of the Abbé Guettée as a Latin priest, and Ab-Youssouf as a Greek priest. We need not be surprised at not seeing other French priests' names, as, however much they may sympathise with the cause, and even write in the journal, they cannot sign the articles. It requires a man with the moral courage of M. Guettée to dare to compromise himself with his superiors, and to bring down upon himself the excommunication of the *Univers*, an excommunication which in most cases involves the loss of bread. The names of laymen belonging both to the Western and the Eastern communion appear. In the seventh number we notice a warm-hearted letter from the Rev. P. G. Medd, of University College, Oxford, who signs himself as *Prêtre de l'Eglise Catholique, du rit anglican*. The conductors of the Anglo-Continental Society have, it would appear, been invited to insert communications touching the belief and position of the English Church.

The extract given above, relative to the English Church, shows a greater appreciation of the true character of the Anglican Church than that which we should have been likely to have met with some years ago. The writer shows himself conscious of the difference which exists between Anglicanism and mere Protestantism, and the same consciousness appears throughout the journal. The following passage is noticeable for the fairness of the spirit displayed in it towards the Oriental and the Anglican Churches, and for the distinction which it draws between Anglicanism, Presbyterianism, and Protestantism. It is on the subject of the seat of Church authority and Holy Orders:—

'The Ultramontane theory of Church government belongs to a fraction of the Roman Catholic Church. It is at present openly favoured by the Court of Rome, which is anxious to propagate it throughout the Church. Nevertheless, the Ultramontane opinion has met with numerous opponents in the bosom of the Latin Church. The Church of France, or the Gallican Church, has always protested against pontifical Absolutism. Recognising the Pope as the first Bishop of the Church, and attributing to him superior prerogatives to those of the other members of the Episcopate, it would

αὐτοῦ τύπου καὶ ὑπαγόμενα ὑπὸ τὸ σκήπτρον τοῦ αὐτοῦ ἀνακτος. Ἡ ἑνωσις τῶν δυνάμεων Ἐκκλησιῶν ἤθελεν εἶναι μᾶλλον συνδέσει τὴν ὑπάρχουσαν καλὴν ἁρμονίαν καὶ τὴν συμπάθειαν μεταξὺ τῶν ἐθνῶν καὶ ἰδρύσει ἐπὶ βάσεων ἀκραδάντων τὴν ὕλην ἐνὶ ἡμερίᾳ ἀμφοτέρων διὰ τῆς πολλαπλασιάσεως τῶν μεταξὺ τῶν συναλλαγῶν.

never allow more than a spiritual power in him, and that power limited by law or canon, and subordinate to the authority of the Episcopate. . . . Thus far Gallicans and Ultramontanes agree, viz.—in considering Bishops enjoy their authority in virtue of a sacrament, that is to say, a religious act, a divine institution, which confers on them a sacred character, and which thus makes them derive their authority from God.

‘All the Catholic Churches of the East, the chief of which are the Greek and the Armenian, agree in this with the Catholic Churches of the West. The Oriental Churches recognise the Pope as the first Patriarch, that is, the first Bishop of the Universal Church. Their belief with respect to his authority has been determined by the first œcumenical councils. The decrees of those great assemblies, at which alone the Eastern and Western Churches have been represented, formed a universal ecclesiastical law at the time of the separation. This law has been modified in the West, with regard to the Papacy, the titles and prerogatives of which have been extended by the Latin Church; but we may remark that these modifications are institutions of a purely disciplinary nature, and that for essential doctrine, that is to say, with respect to the seat of Church authority, the Oriental Churches are in perfect agreement with the Gallican Church, with the ancient Church of Africa, and with the other Churches of the Patriarchate of the West anterior to the seventeenth century. Their common belief, then, should be regarded as the true *Catholic* belief, which must be carefully distinguished from Ultramontane opinion.

‘We notice in the bosom of Protestantism two Churches which profess an intermediate doctrine between the Catholic belief and the different opinions which are radically Protestant. These are the Churches of England and Sweden. Both of them are governed by Bishops, and recognise in these Bishops a particular character resulting from their ordination, and conferring upon them authority for governing the Church. That which distinguishes their belief from that of the Eastern and Gallican Churches is, that they do not regard ordination as a sacrament properly so called, that is to say, as being of divine institution, and that they only make of it a ceremony, ancient, respectable, apostolical, but of ecclesiastical institution. On all other points, the Anglican and Scottish Churches allow to Bishops an authority analogous to that which the Catholic Churches of the East and West recognise in them.

‘The Protestant Presbyterian Churches only differ from the Episcopal in this, that they recognise in Presbyters the right which the others give to Bishops. According to the Catholic Churches, and to the Protestant Episcopal Churches, priests have only a delegated authority; they are only vicars of the Bishops, and do not constitute an authority in the Church of Christ. Presbyterians only allow of one authority, that which results from ordination: all presbyters therefore enjoy it. And Bishops can only be priests invested with superior prerogatives for the *surveillance* of the Churches—prerogatives of ecclesiastical right, of a disciplinary nature, which do not confer upon them a power essentially superior to that of simple priests.

‘Amongst all these opinions or beliefs there is a point of union. It is, that Christ has established in his Church an authority for governing and guiding the faithful in the way of salvation, and that this authority is conferred by means of an ordination which gives a particular stamp to him who receives it.

‘Protestants, properly so called, do not admit this doctrine. They only see the faithful in the Church. Elders, ministers, all the dignitaries of the Church, are but delegates of the faithful: the authority which they enjoy emanates from them: the prayers which accompany their appointment to

the ministry are only a pious ceremony, and do not confer upon them anything which really distinguishes them from the faithful laity.

'Putting aside the Episcopal and Presbyterian Churches of which we have spoken, all Protestantism agrees in this, that there is no authority, properly so called, in the Church, apart from the body of the faithful. All the other Churches, on the contrary, regard this authority as of divine institution, though they differ on the nature and value of ordination.'—P. 35.

'Protestants, properly so called,' and 'the Anglican Church,' are here distinguished in a way which is new as coming from a Roman Catholic writer. The above extract will also serve as a specimen of the calm and argumentative manner in which M. Guettée conducts his researches.

There was a time when the thought of Church Unity used to stir men's hearts amongst us, and to touch a chord to which a response was readily returned. Is that time passed away? True it is that Church Unity has been made a cry by some who have meant little by it but an excuse for disloyalty towards their mother-Church. True that some, far more earnest and far better men than those to whom we have last referred, have been beguiled by the idea into unrealities, and have forced themselves into a belief and declaration that things amongst ourselves are totally different from what they really are, for the sake of representing to themselves and to others that a factitious unity exists where it exists not. True that some, in their search after Unity, have been led into the lamentable error of throwing themselves at the feet of the Pope, and asking him to be their centre and bond to make them one, 'when the Lord their God was their King.' And these too patent evils, which have resulted from the yearning after Unity, have caused us to grow weary of the very name. Men judge by consequences; and if these are the consequences, they say, let us hear no more of it. We know that a preacher who offered himself as a candidate for the Bampton lectureship, and would have been likely to have delivered good lectures, was rejected because he selected so unpropitious a subject as Unity. It is natural. In this, as well as other things, Churchmen must suffer for the errors and wrong-doings of those who have been, or in the popular estimation are still, associated with them. It is natural. But yet Christ's prayer for Unity remains. Our Master's last loving words inculcating Unity remain. The apostolic injunctions on Unity remain. The aspirations of the highest and noblest hearts in all ages of the Church have been for Unity. The best and holiest of our English divines have ever yearned for Unity. The Church of England prays entreatingly and almost with wailing for Unity. Surely we must long, and pray, and work for Unity if we are true Christians.

But what sort of Unity? and on what principles? Not the narrow dull Unity of the Ultramontane, and, with few exceptions, of the whole Roman Catholic Church, which substitutes the Western Patriarch for Christ, as the centre of Unity to all Christians, the bond of union amongst the faithful, and the corner-stone of the Church; which gathers men around one of the captains of the great army, and bids them denounce war and havoc on all the other companies which equally with them constitute the one whole; and which in place of the internal cohesion of the Spirit of Love, seeks for a compulsory uniformity of ecclesiastical institution, discipline, and ritual. Not the vague, negative, meaningless Unity which the Evangelical Alliance and its supporters are blindly seeking after, which ignores the framework of the Church, and must, if successful at all, come to be little else than agreement in essential differences. But the Unity which is not a Utopia, which has existed and may exist again, the Unity of the Church such as it exhibited itself in the primitive Church, when the spirit of love reigned throughout the body and formed the internal bond of cohesion, while a federal union between the great Patriarchates and 'Diocesan' Churches as they were then called (*national* Churches as they would be called now) formed the external links of part to part. The great cause of the overthrow of this Unity was the ambition of Rome, which was not contented with her place in the body, but would be the head, and assume the place which belonged to her Lord. The first step towards Unity must be a recognition that neither the Pope of Rome, nor the Patriarch of Constantinople, nor the Archbishop of Canterbury, nor any one bishop, wheresoever situated, is or can be the axis round which the wheel revolves; that east and west, north and south, Romanists, Orientals, Anglicans, Protestants, are all of the Church, as holding to Christ the Head over all; that amongst these, so different in many respects, *uniformity* is neither to be expected nor desired; that their *unity* must be a unity in the Truth as it is revealed in Holy Scripture and testified to by the Church, and in Love spread abroad throughout the members from Christ the Head; that their *union* must be the federal union which did bind the Church together as long as it remained one. The recognition of this theory, we say, is the first step towards Church Unity; and then follows the work of realizing it.

Almost for the first time, we have seen on the part of a pious, and learned, and courageous Roman Catholic priest, a reaching out after this conception, and an attempt at realizing it. We congratulate the Anglo-Continental Society on this the most legitimate and most satisfactory response which could have been

given to their appeal to their Continental brethren. The primary object, no doubt, of the latter Society is the spreading abroad a knowledge of what the English Church and her doctrine are, but a further object is the union of Christendom 'on the principles of the Anglican Church, which are also the principles of the primitive Church.' The object of M. Guettée and his *collaborateurs* is also the union of Christendom on the principles of the primitive Church, in contradistinction to those of Ultramontanism and of religious Liberalism. The articles in the *Union Chrétienne* could not have been written by an Ultramontane, and could not have been written by a religious Liberal; but there is scarcely a sentence throughout them with which a loyal-hearted Anglican Churchman could not agree. May we not expect a similar movement in Germany? in Sweden? in the East? 'In the morning sow thy seed, and in the evening withdraw not thy hand, for thou knowest not whether may prosper, either this or that, or whether they both may be alike good.'

France has given much to Christendom. She has given us the Benedictine editions of the Fathers; she has given us the Port Royalists; she has given us Bossuet. If from her shall go forth a movement the result of which shall be to unite the severed Churches in the unity of the Truth and of Love, we shall have more reason to thank her than for any other work that she shall have accomplished or for any idea which has emanated from her.

ART. VI.—1. *Realities of Paris Life*. London: Hurst and Blackett. 1859.

2. *Flemish Interiors*. London: Longman.

3. *A Glance behind the Grilles of Religious Houses*. London: Edward Lumley.

OUR idea of 'a convert' has to go through many modifications as experience matures. In our youth it implied previous intense solitary conflict; a struggle, long anxious thought, all the resources of reason brought to bear on one agonizing question. However far we might differ from the conclusion, we assumed a hard single-handed fight with doubts and difficulties; and took for granted that there must necessarily have been conscientious effort to arrive at truth, and an honest attempt to face all the bearings of the momentous subject, in the individual's own proper person. In the act of leaving the Church of our fathers there seemed no escape from private judgment. In transferring ourselves to a new allegiance, no human mind could think for us, we could lean on no human arm, we must cross the bridge alone.

The 'convert,' in abandoning all the light of association and tradition, his early teachers, his first impressions, the home of his prayers, the soul's long refuge, was leaving authority behind, and arrogating the full mastership over himself. To accept at this juncture the workings and conclusions of another mind for his own, would have seemed to us a base surrender of his inherent rights as a rational being. We are speaking now of the mere act of change, which to be worth anything must be an independent act. To go from one system which tells you what to think, to another system which does the same, without the reason being employed in the transaction, implies an enslaved judgment, led by accident, or prejudice, or fancy, but certainly not by conscience. We assumed then that the convert could not blindly enrol himself member of another Church without a very critical self-examination, to make sure that he accepted fully, literally, one by one with all his heart, every article of his new creed; that while forsaking one Church because it taught some points, because it permitted some things, only some, from which he dissented, he could not throw himself into another which made larger demands on his faith, while there was a single article at which he stumbled, to which his mind

opposed doubts. It would not be fair to take anything on trust ; he might have done that under the former rule.

No one, we are willing to grant, can arrive at the state of pure impartiality, absolute candour, freedom from prejudice, deliberate judgment, unfettered reason and single absorbing consciousness of a supreme appeal and judge,—a consciousness throwing all other considerations into the shade as though they did not exist,—which seemed to us implied in a change of religion from honest conviction ; but nevertheless we believe something like it constitutes every one's abstract ideal, before circumstances call on him to moderate it. No one is prepared beforehand for the amount of physical, material attraction which human influence exercises in these matters. In the abstract it seems absurd that one mind can accept the conclusions of another in unseen spiritual questions without any labour of its own, that it can believe what it never believed before in a moment at another's bidding, that it can contentedly remain in doubt so long as Mr. So-and-So doubts, believing itself to live in the light of God's favour, having no fears, no misgivings ; but when Mr. So-and-So's doubts change to certainty, suffer an instant eclipse, as though the light of the divine presence went with him, feeling restless, miserable, forsaken, dark, till it can again borrow its illumination from him. What, we ask, can be the real impressions of this quailing, timid, shivering consciousness as to the nature of the Infinite and All-seeing ; the Father of us all ? How is it that he allows the domineering shadow of a human intellect to come between him and his Maker ? Whom does he accept as his judge ? Who understands him best ? To whom does he refer his motives, the inmost questionings of his heart ? Who alone knows what belief is ? Who alone cannot be deceived ?

These are questions that cannot, we think, but have arisen, whether quite fairly or not, when we have witnessed, as in years past, a great man 'going over' with his followers, and contrasted the conduct and attitude of his various friends and disciples under the trial. He left some behind, heavy, sorrowful, heartbroken, who in the bitterness of a first parting may even have wished that they could follow him too. But the answer came with stern distinctness, 'I cannot ;' and while they could not, the duty was plain, the thought was regarded as a temptation and set aside. Others surely have said resolutely, 'I will try,' not because any new light was thrown upon the question, not because they saw things in a new point of view, but because they felt dull and desolate and bare when left alone. Their intellect had lost a controlling presence, they felt they could not live alone, they could not believe themselves safe or in the right,

now the one human rock and pillar had failed them. Time, and the inevitable experience which time brings, modifies our expectation of absolutely independent action. We cease to wonder at what is common. Men do influence one another in unaccountable ways, nor can we distinctly mark the line where legitimate influence ends. We are of the nature of sheep, and will follow a leader; and this being the case, perhaps the wonder rather is that more have not been so influenced. There is no doubt that the leaders of twelve or fourteen years ago expected a larger retinue of adherents; to which class all that we have said exclusively applies, as alone to the point in our present subject.

In the utter separation which usually follows their desertion,—a separation which circumstances scarcely under the control of either side render inevitable,—we are left much in the dark as to the future course of thought and turn of interests which ‘the converts’ as a body have inherited from their momentous step. We hear now and then of young people trained in the new system turning monks and nuns, and choosing the strictest orders for their profession; but what process of thought and of events has led to a fate so at variance with their early prospects we are left to guess: whether it has been done in the rigour of self-sacrifice, or because the new sphere of action offers no career, or simply as being natural that the points of difference between the old and new system of thought should take the strongest hold, and mould first the character and then the destiny. All persons who act as it seems for conscience’ sake, often to the detriment of their temporal concerns, possess some interest for us; or even when we doubt the reality of that conscientiousness, and suspect mere hero-worship where they assume independent conviction, the weakness is too common to tender natures altogether to alienate our regard. The step need not necessarily produce entire estrangement, unless (as in so many tempers it does) it prompts to outrage in those points where still we might have felt together—unless the original weakness did not extend itself to a defiance and blind repudiation of everything connected with that past from which the idol has separated himself.

The interest (such as they possess) of the series from a convert’s pen, which heads our article, lies in the answer they offer to such speculations and inquiries, as giving us some insight into the motives which in many instances may have first led to a change of communion, the state of mind that attended that change, and the principles and temper which have resulted from it. It perhaps is rather necessarily an unfavourable specimen, for amiable people do not turn upon and expose old

friends, nor would we do such injustice to a class as to attribute to them the extremes that characterise this writer; but we believe her faults to be only the extremes of very common errors, and we cannot but regard her excessive rancour against the Church she has left, and the country towards which she no longer recognises the duty of patriotism, her blind prejudice, her determination to see only the things she wishes to see, and to ignore all that goes against her prepossessions, as betraying what are the tendencies of such a position and how they may develop themselves. We speak of *her* prejudices because, though it suits the writer's plan to speak of herself uniformly as originally a priest of the English Church, it does not need general uncontradicted report to convince every reader of the really feminine origin of these pictures of foreign life; and the purpose for which this disguise was originally adopted—to give weight to opinion, and to imply superior opportunities for forming a judgment—indicates what we believe to be another of the tendencies we have alluded to, that of making strictness and austerity of life a greater test of spirituality than an ingenuous simplicity of conversation and bearing.

This lady's tone leads us to suppose her one of Dr. Manning's conquests, at least she boasts of the irresistible force of his eloquence. She enlarges his European reputation, 'he being more fully appreciated abroad than even in England,' while on hearing him styled 'L'apôtre de l'Angleterre,' she confirms the praise by her testimony; observing, 'that I believed it was often said the refined and winning manners of this distinguished man, combined with a singular vigour and perspicuity of reasoning, and a happy command of language, tended to fascinate many who came within their influence; but though I did not mean to deny him these external gifts, I felt sure that the result was due to his inflexible faith, clear perception of truth, profound knowledge of the human heart, and rather therefore to supernatural than to superficial attractions.' The master must not be made answerable for the disciple; but if, as we may perhaps infer from this passage, the lady's conversion was the immediate result of personal influence, we may class her amongst those who have followed a leader.

Our readers may, perhaps, remember her first work, 'A Glance behind the Grilles of Religious Houses, with a Comparative View of the Working of the Church System Abroad and at Home.' This professed to be written while still a member, and as we have said a priest, of the English Church; to sustain which assumption it is solemnly dedicated 'To my brethren in Christ, the Clergy of the Church of England, in the hope that they will agree with me in admiring the results of that

'unity which (while it is unhappily lost to us) forms the sure and enduring basis of an organization, for the restoration of which among ourselves we should do well to unite in prayer.' This call for united prayer certainly jars on the reader who has previously looked through the pages of the book, as a profanation; for it is invoked to decide a foregone conclusion. The whole design of the work betrays the same turn for subterfuge, and shows a mind dim in its perception of abstract right and wrong, true and false, rendered deliberately disingenuous by the spirit of controversy.

We have quoted this inscription at length, as containing the two ideas which constitute the greatness and the attraction of the Church of Rome to this class of minds, ideas which are in a certain sense independent of that Church's doctrines, and for the sake of which the doctrines have probably been accepted with very slight investigation. These two ideas are asceticism and organization. With this good lady, to associate together for the purposes of walking barefoot and habitually sleeping upright constitutes the triumph of Christianity. She gives details of excessive austerities in the persuasion that they must convince even Protestants of the truth of the whole Papal system. As the greater includes the less; this, embracing as it does the theory of merit, seems to include all doctrine. 'He can't be wrong whose life is in the right.' She may indeed, in the character of an English inquirer, stop now and then to object to a Romish practice, but the first word convinces her. Thus, after hearing a most extravagant sermon from a Trappist monk on the efficacy of prayer to the Virgin—prayer repeated mechanically by a robber and murderer, and which was rewarded by a miraculous interposition in his favour, performed by an image of the Virgin which he passed on his way to the gallows; our authoress, while 'fascinated by the earnestness and energy of the preacher,' states herself to have received the assurance of another Trappist 'that Catholics never pray to the Virgin, but only for her intercession,' with instant, implicit belief. 'Je vous remercie pour cette explication; elle est si nettement posée que je me garderai bien de l'oublier.' Indeed, she assumes throughout that austerity secures enlightenment. And if ascetism means pure faith, organization means in the same degree fervent charity. We are not disputing the existence of fervent charity in France; but here it is the organization which gives the fervour, and we are constantly told that England cannot have the charity because it has not the systematic organization. It is this that makes her so satirical on a married clergy, it interferes so much with organization; it is this that gives such an immense superiority to France over her own

country, for France is the acknowledged country for organization. What praise is not due to a religious system that has a separate *Euvre* for the conversion of mountebanks, and a fraternity for the education of chimney-sweeps? Where do we meet with such things in London? It is no use to reply that we have done away with chimney-sweeps altogether,—that is an act of mere philanthropy; and for philanthropy, which means the whole class of English charity, she professes utter contempt. To minds of this order, evil might seem to have as necessary and recognised a place as good. There is the evil and there is the remedy; every abuse has its corrective, every vice is met and combated on its own ground. All honour to those who in Paris order their warfare after this fashion. It is the French way. They act according to precedent and temperament, and every well-intentioned effort may hope for its reward; but we cannot see that the present condition and aspect of Paris tells much for the value of the system as such, or argues for its exclusive adoption. However, it is certain that nothing so much persuades people that a real work is being done as to lay out a distinct method for the doing of it; and perhaps the following naïve reflection of our authoress may hit the real feelings of many who think they go deeper into things than it is in her nature to do.

‘It seems to me that if young girls go wrong in Paris, it must be by an inherent tendency to evil. I do not mean to say but that temptation abounds there, and that to an extent perhaps scarcely conceived by a casual observer; but so great is the activity and vigilance of the Church and her numerous *societies* with regard to the particular evil, that one is quite bewildered among the countless *œuvres* she has set in motion in behalf of young females.’—*Glance behind the Grilles*, p. 125.

As the lesson attempted to be taught in all these books is one and the same—the superiority of religious action in Paris in particular, and Roman Catholic countries generally, over London—and as two of them are mainly catalogues of examples to prove this point, we may as well state at once, that while admiring the zeal and pure aim of those who labour honestly in this vast and varied field, it yet appears to us that this blind trust in organization and *œuvres* as a national quality has the effect of relaxing individual effort. There always seems a more obvious course than doing that duty oneself that nature gave us to do. The most depraved, those who neglect the first principles of humanity, see that there is an elaborate system provided to rectify their errors, and nullify their bad effects. For example, an enormous machinery is on foot, a vast sum of existences are devoted (to the sacrifice of all natural ties), to train up children abandoned by their parents from the birth. But, not to dwell on this extreme case, which has been often discussed,

respectable family life is equally affected by this principle. The lovers of system, and those who set themselves to work out systems, are jealous of the seeming laxity of home influence, and lay themselves out to correct it by a mighty organization of schools. It would seem by the lists we read here, as if the *frères* and the *sœurs* of Paris would not leave a single child in its parents' hands, and they have their way, for the *ouvrier* class are willing to give up their children to them for an education which involves no expense, if it admits no interference. Even the holidays are short and rare, to preserve their scholars from contamination. Evidently proud of the extent and minuteness of their precautions, and the exact order of their regulations, the pervading control over mind and body they believe themselves to have accomplished, they have gladly exhibited to the English convert the organization which has effected such great things, and above all the ceaseless vigilance which keeps the complicated machinery in motion. It is a system which, carefully carried out, is sure to have a show of seeming fruit. Not a single misgiving seems ever to have visited either party, exhibitor or witness, that the acme of success had not been attained. How can mischief creep in when children are removed from the bad influence of home, and never permitted to receive a single evil impression? The thing is reduced in our authoress's mind to a syllogism. *Surveillance*, that French handmaid to organization, makes it impossible. 'C'est par une surveillance de tous les instans' that boys are kept under. Even the dormitories have no division or separation of any kind, because the *surveillance* can be more effectual. She thinks she sees its effects in a frankness and ingenuousness of character for which our schoolboys would be all the better. Girls are even protected from their parents by this pervading influence.

'The Supérieure was very communicative, and told me that this was an *œuvre* for the combined religious and secular education of young girls of the upper classes—a work which I do not think has ever been thought of amongst ourselves. Forty sisters devote themselves to the care of the pupils. Professors attend to instruct them in languages and accomplishments; but always give their lessons in the presence of one of the sisters. Indeed, they seem never to lose sight of their charges, as, when visited by their friends, or even parents, a sister is always seated behind the grille, in the parlour in which they receive them.'—*Ibid.* p. 11.

The sisters never willingly part with their pupils, even to take a walk with their parents, lest they should see what is going on in the world; they have no confidence in any one out of convent walls, nor in their own pupils, sufficient to trust that a curtain to a bed may not hide a dangerous secret from the constant vigilant eye.

'I am persuaded (cries our authoress in admiration) there is nothing to be had in England to compare with it at *any* price. How should there be? The principle on which they work is wholly different there (in Paris), it is a labour of self-sacrifice and a work of love; here it is a question of profit—a commercial speculation—a matter of pounds, shillings, and pence. There moral training and religious instruction, imparted with a watchful eye to the formation of character, form the basis of education, and it is clear that the social relations the pupils hold with these noble-minded and disinterested women, whose sole aim is to benefit them without any personal reward, *must* produce a very different moral result from the cold, suspicious, unconfiding intercourse which necessarily exists between a grasping schoolmistress, aided by hired underlings, and the young ladies, who are well aware they have a right to what they pay for.'—*Ibid.* p. 274.

The question of course is, Can any system secure absolute openness? Our authoress who sees no difficulties assumes that it can; that by dint of never taking an eye off a girl or boy, day or night, it is possible to insure inner rectitude: and therefore she sums up the subject by concluding, 'that those to whom it occurred to found and organize these institutions must have understood better than similar founders in England the peculiar characteristics of the young.' But in fact no mind can be really laid bare for any length of time and remain sane; every mind must have its secrets. The effect of this tremendous *surveillance*, we believe, must be to make this secret a conscious one. Under ordinary natural training the child is unconscious of its own reserves. A practice of concealment cannot fail to be maturing under this system of scrutiny, which may have much to do with the unchildish childhood and youth of French boys and girls which all observers of Parisian life dwell upon. We have touched on the subject here because it seems that this fundamental difference of training may have much to do with the national differences in the mode of effecting all great objects. Those trained to organization from their infancy organize in their turn; while the English, more independent, more subject to local accidental influences, and especially to the spirit of home, may seem to our neighbours to be working without system, and to such witnesses as our authoress not to be working at all. This prevalence of system, lay or cleric, is regarded differently according to the observer's estimate of the French character and institutions. Those whose sympathies go with the present aspect of affairs in Church and State consider it the secret of their greatness; others see in it an indication of that weakness which has produced and which exhibits such deplorable fruits.

'There is no people (says Mr. Bayle St. John) so systematic as the French—a characteristic I am sometimes disposed to attribute to their want of power of self-guidance. Nothing, according to them, is well done that is not done by rule. They talk freely of inspiration or vivid impulses, but take care never to trust them. We must all remember the time when,

in ardent pursuit of knowledge, we have portioned out our days and hours for particular studies; giving the morning to the classics, the afternoon to philosophy, Monday to history, Saturday to physics, and so on. Experience has taught us, that in this way we seem to go over a great deal of ground, and learn nothing after all. In most things, but especially their ideas of education, the French have not got beyond this period.'

By this showing, all the scrutiny, order, and vigilance detailed by our authoress seem to fall short of actual influence for good; if we are to believe, too, the *look* of things and concurrent testimony of a crowd of witnesses, native and foreign. The separation from home, perhaps still more the assumption of superior goodness both of person and calling in the teacher, the submission of parents to this external claim may well have weakened parental authority; though in France the relation of mother and child has always been distinguished by a peculiar tenderness of expression. 'He who was sent forth a pet child returns home a stranger,' says one who knows Paris life well. 'Friendships between brothers and sisters are rarely heard of, 'at any rate in Paris.' A French writer, M. Leguardier, has even written:—

'Family life no longer exists in France, unless we choose to give that name to an accidental aggregation of members, over which chance rather than affection presides. They collect together from habit; they shun one another from *ennui*, and they separate from interest when they can do without one another.'

We feel how likely something like this may be the case where a girl leaves her convent only to contract a marriage arranged for her by her parents; and who can suppose that under her new circumstances the remembrance of the *surveillance* under which her childhood has been passed can have such influence as a support and defence in temptation as the traditions and associations of home? Whether for good or evil, such a system of education, as all books on France reveal, establishes the one great difference between that country and our own, that of all the domestic relations—a vital difference, which must inevitably influence every public and private institution in either country.

On such questions as these, however, our authoress does not enter. She takes results for granted with the easiest credulity where the agency is to her mind; indeed, we might sometimes suppose that results were of minor importance to the means, so entranced is she with the meritorious self-sacrifice manifested in these undertakings—a fact which if made too apparent to the youthful scholar, must, we think, tell unfavourably on the affections as not being Nature's plan for their earliest cultivation. For it is a different position to be loved because it is charity to love us, because it is an *œuvre*, and perhaps a very difficult

one, perfumed in the spirit of self-sacrifice, and to bask in love which the child feels to belong to it by right, which comes to it through the ties of blood and the irresistible instincts of nature. And as this sublime and conspicuous self-denial is scarcely an indemnity for mothers' love, so we do not see that it need be more than an equivalent for that regard and tenderness which a good woman bestows on charges she has undertaken primarily for the just and virtuous end of earning her own living. Especially as it is even said that the sisters who direct girls' schools are particularly severe in their punishments, a charge which cannot be brought against any form of English education. But the language used habitually by this authoress towards honest industry too commonly accompanies an indiscriminating enthusiasm for what in technical language is called a more brilliant career.

It is time, however, to enter more particularly into the design of the works before us, and their author's fitness, moral and intellectual, for her task. As her first book professed to be a candid survey of the differences between the Church she was leaving and that she was adopting, the next, '*Flemish Interiors*,' written after her change is avowed, expresses her enthusiasm for all that is peculiar and distinctive in the Church of her adoption; while the last, '*Realities of Paris Life*' (though, as we write, we observe an announcement of another forthcoming work from the same pen), leaving Romanism in its purely ecclesiastical aspect, aims at showing us the picture of a city more or less under its influence—the world upon which it works. In the first flush of novelty which inspired her early pen, the English reader is roundly rebuked for caring to observe anything else when he goes abroad but the inner workings of the Church; in the last he is permitted some return to ordinary interests, but only under certain conditions, and with the authoress for his guide. The conceit which the possession of a new idea engenders, the sense of a monopoly, in truth, was never more distinctly developed than in them all. The first page falls foul of Murray's Handbook. 'Every man who consults that useful guide is a 'cockney,' who would think it as impossible to cross the Channel without his Handbook as to reach heaven without his Bible. 'But, reader, you will find no sympathy between us; my object 'being to introduce those who will accompany me into the hidden 'courts of those dwelling places of spiritual life of which the 'Handbook does not even mention the exterior,' and always the superiority of her motives and objects of interest are proclaimed with a self-sufficiency that only a mind, incapable of seeing the real bearing of things, and intoxicated by first impressions, could give voice to; though, of course, the temper of mind is natu-

ral and to be guarded against by every impressionable nature. Here the British traveller is loaded with sarcasm for looking only at the outside of things as he passes through Belgium, or for entering a church to 'stare' at a pulpit or to gaze at a picture; 'and all the while they are not even conscious that within that high silent wall, or behind that closed gateway, works of mercy, of penance, and of charity are sending their noiseless perfume up to heaven.' Whether the traveller is conscious or not of these facts, depends on individual opportunities; but it is no proof that he is indifferent to religion and virtue, that he does not seek to penetrate behind the screen—the time taken to do so ever so cursorily would defeat the object of his journey. What is inner and hidden can never meet the gaze of the passer-by; it would be just as reasonable to require every ecclesiologist who visits a church to make acquaintance with the rector and curate, as for those who enter a Belgian church to seek an interview with the priest. Besides, we may ask this lady and those she represents, what do people really learn by a hasty passing glance, if they have not further opportunities for weighing the justice of first impressions? We cannot but think that a longer acquaintance would have modified some of her own; and we therefore receive with caution the flowing details of austerities which she accepted without a question; for example, we should like to know what definite meaning is to be attached to the statement that a whole community of women can accomplish an entire day of unbroken contemplation:—

'The same pious custom is pursued by all the sisters who in their fêtes, or days for which their founders had a particular devotion, as well as on Fridays, pass the entire day in religious contemplation. They assert that these are their happiest seasons, and that they never seem to last long enough; insomuch that although the rule only appoints the duration of their meditation till six o'clock, they are only too glad to be allowed to continue it till bed-time.'—*Flemish Interiors*, p. 26.

And of the same sisters such facts as the following, though we assume a foundation of truth, yet in their effects on body and mind we must still hear further before the information can be edifying or more than curious. We are very certain that we are not told all that it is necessary to know for a right apprehension.

'There would seem to be no austerity these sisters do not practise; although barefoot, their floors are of brick, and they allow themselves no fire, even in the severest weather. They never lie down, but sleep upright. I went up a narrow corkscrew stone staircase into their cells, and saw their extraordinary beds; they consist of a hard and almost cylindrical mattress, stuffed with straw, about three feet long, at right angles to which is fixed an equally hard upright palliasso, to support the back. There is no pillow, neither are there sheets, and only one small thin blanket.'—*Ibid.* p. 27.

In like manner we own to a questioning spirit as to the real

posture of mind of the English girl of nineteen, niece to an English archbishop, who had joined this order, with whom the writer had an interview. The attachment of the mind to its domicile is, we know, not in proportion to the pleasure found there, but to its estrangement from every other locality. But the attachment of habit had not yet influence over this young girl; we therefore read of her deportment with curiosity and some sadness in spite of her visitor's glowing conviction. The novice showed her face for an instant through the grille, and then hid it behind the shutter.

'She spoke in a timid, hurried manner, which may possibly have been natural to her; but nothing could be more expressive of cheerfulness, not to say hilarity, than the tone of her voice. Indeed, I was told afterwards that she and another young novice, a Dutch lady, skipped about "like two kittens" for joy at the thought that they were so soon to make their profession. . . . She said she had never been so happy in her life; the delight she experienced at the thought of her approaching reception was so great, that she sometimes felt as if it were too much happiness for this world. She affirmed she had never felt the slightest mischief or inconvenience from walking barefoot, and that she had never enjoyed such good health as since she commenced her noviciate. She asked my friend after his wife and children, and seemed pleased when we gave her some information of her brothers, who, like her, were recent converts.—*Ibid.* p. 30.

Who recognises the English girl in this profuse expression of feeling, this kittenish transport, this lukewarm interest in family news? What strange processes had her mind been subjected to, to have already lost all nationality? A passing interview is not enough to account for the phenomenon. Still, while we attribute credulity to our authoress, a willingness to believe on insufficient evidence both good and bad that suits her purpose, we accept her statements as the results of her own observation; but she is mistaken, and those whose opinion in this matter she represents, that the insight she would give us into monastic life in all its force and strictness, can have any persuasive effect on the English reader unless the system is shown to work some evident strengthening and invigorating change on the mind and character beyond what habitual self-control and moderate abstinence are known to accomplish. She sneers at Protestant Bible readers; and we must say that reading the Bible does not prepare us for such pictures of Christianity as she brings before us, either in the asceticism which she terms a triumph over human nature or in its effect on the intellect. She expects us to be charmed with a certain imbecility which she takes for Christian simplicity and guilelessness. We are not *blaming* it in the examples she brings before us,—it is probably an inevitable consequence of the mode of life; but we cannot forget that S. Paul has said, 'In understanding be ye men.' And are we mistaken in calling puerile such scenes as the

following? Father Ignatius, an English Trappist, pays a visit with a Père Carmelite and our authoress to a Carmelite nunnery ; and the point, in recording what passed, is to show the infantine vivacity of spirits under extreme bodily privation. The Mère Sous-Prieure receives them behind a curtain which is never removed. Some pleasantry occurs at the outset between the monk and the nun on their comparative means of forming a personal acquaintance. The latter then receives in solemn silence some information from the Père, but

‘When he introduced Father Ignatius as a Trappist monk, she made no attempt to disguise the delight with which she heard the information. The effect was talismanic. They immediately entered into a brisk and animated colloquy, and soon found a point of common interest in the reciprocal devotion of their respective orders of S. Theresa and S. Bernard. After some conversation on the subject, it was mutually agreed that they should endeavour to prevail on their superiors to interchange the intentions of their respective masses on the two days dedicated to these saints, an idea which appeared to afford infinite satisfaction to both.’—*Ibid.* p. 80.

We are not disposed to class under the same head the zest for manual occupation, of which she gives instances as a proof of humility and devotion ; yet we see in it neither the one nor the other, so much as the wholesome love of work denied a larger sphere. Here is a picture with which even the ordinary traveller is familiar, on which he has drawn his own comments. It is a Frère Redemptoriste preparing for the *fête* of S. Alphonse Liguori, a name familiar to these pages, for whom this author professes a peculiar devotion, as offering us the example of a life ‘almost dazzling us with its brilliancy’ in contrast with the surrounding gloom of modern times.

‘One of the brothers was decorating it (the altar) with unusual care. He had a vast number of flower-pots containing roses and other plants in full bloom, and seemed very fastidious about placing them. He fixed and unfixed, arranged and rearranged them again and again, getting down from the steps on which he was mounted, and viewing his performance from a little distance each time to judge of the effect. This was no slight labour, especially as every time he passed the tabernacle he dropped on one knee in front of it. This being done, he brought out some large and handsome candlesticks, containing tall *cierges*, and spent much time and thought on their disposal likewise.

In another place she exclaims, ‘They seem to glory in performing the most humiliating offices. In one room through which we passed, one was papering the walls, and another, ‘with a large brush, whitewashing the ceiling’ (in some country parsonages at home, we do not doubt the same marvellous acts of humiliation and self-denial may be witnessed); ‘all looked cheerful and good-humoured over their work.’ We have no doubt these good brothers would

be not a little amused at the grandeur attributed to their contentment. But this is one instance of the undiscerning quality of our authoress's judgment. Most people *like* manual occupation, and to be employed in real productive labour, if they can do it without loss of caste. Monks and nuns are certain, in most cases, to enjoy it, from their peculiar circumstances. Not that they have necessarily lost all sense of this world's rank, but that no station is compromised. Yet she thinks it noteworthy, and a trait of the superiority of one Church over the other, that an abbé should not be ashamed to introduce to her his aunt, a sister of S. Vincent de Paul, while that good lady was peeling carrots. Had he greeted a labourer's wife in a bye-lane so occupied as a near relation, it might have proved something; but the action in a nunnery only showed the habits of the order, of which he might even be proud on the occasion of showing it to a foreigner. It is only an example of a very common habit with minds upset by the fever of change, and whose interest it is to see things in an aspect to justify that change.

These works, however, are written not only under the disability of estimating things at their right value, which all novices labour under, but with the further disadvantage of a false assumption. Everything is asserted to have been viewed under different circumstances from the real ones, which is enough of itself to give an erroneous impression. We would not be over-critical, and authors have a right to preserve their incognito; but when a lady professes to suffer under all the anxieties of the ministerial life, to be full of the doubts that position has engendered, when it is a question how many celebrations of the Holy Communion she will arrange on her return, when she professes to know 'other parish priests similarly situated with myself,' and remembers 'asking the same question of a brother clergyman in England,' the bounds of truth and honesty are transgressed, and we detect in these gratuitous attempts at deception, as in other places, a sympathy with the science of casuistry, and an amusement in going as near the wind as conscience can possibly allow, which tells ill for her value as a stater of facts. The thing had apparently a new interest to her. We have a specimen of trying a hand at a pious fraud in 'the Grilles,' evidently an experiment of a new sensation. It is where, making acquaintance with an English boy, of Protestant parents, and finding him ill, she sends a sister, also a convert, to nurse him, adding a request that she would not interfere with his faith. 'By no means,' says sister Mary, 'our charity is not confined to the body.' 'In which case,' answers our authoress, 'I must beg you not to

'go. It would never do for me to interfere with the intentions 'of those who have control over him.' 'But,' says the sister, 'you can't prevent my going.' 'Of course (said I, secretly 'admiring her zeal) you can do as you please; I have no power 'to stop you; but you must remember, my request was only 'made conditionally.' This is very clumsy work, certainly; but our authoress, under a show of readiness and sharpness, has a clumsy mind, quite at fault how to establish a real relation with her reader, and unable to calculate on the effect on others of the processes of her own reason. It is the courage of insensibility which we have observed to be the courage of talkative disputers in religion, and is founded on the misplaced confidence of egotism, such as leads this lady to expect her readers to be shocked that a pew-opener at Bath cannot answer whether there is a 'celebration' that morning, so soon as she has adopted the new word into her vocabulary: and to wonder with her what the benighted Welsh landlady would have said to the 'eighty masses a day in the Cathedral of Cordova,' when the good woman had been led to the general admission that 'we cannot have too much of a good thing.'

The style of these volumes reflects, or rather is formed by, the various characteristics of thought and position which have dictated them. It is a patchwork of French-English, borrowed from French statistics and French authors, and common, not to say vulgar, colloquial English, seasoned at times with a certain slang phraseology designed to represent manly roughness, but never getting beyond feminine *fastness*. The spirited 'Bravo, Lord John, say we!' the allusion to 'Bacchus, the rosy god,' the reference to 'our waistcoat-pocket,' the 'coarse hide' of the poor fish-wife, even the wealth of classical allusion, the constant reference to Horace and Ovid, Euripides and Sophocles, can't take us in. The woman stands confessed through all, not writing in her own person, but as she thinks men write when in a reckless vein; indulging at one time in a string of bad puns, at another in irreverent scriptural allusion, for our authoress has imbibed a thoroughly Popish sentiment towards the English Version. Altogether, the style fitly expresses one of those minds which, looking only on the surface, sees no difficulties, and finds it perfectly easy to reconcile everything to its own standard.

In this temper and with these capabilities the authoress has undertaken to show us the hidden life of Paris, the realities where ordinary observers only see the surface. She has gone about. She has taken notes. She has made a catalogue of *œuvres*. She has consulted documents. She has laboriously visited the 'rookeries' and the 'cité's ouvrières.' She devotes a

chapter to the 'Chiffonniers' and the *quartier* where they exist. She carries us to the asylums, and gives details of their working. She describes the gamin, the charlatan, the thieves, the soldiers, the prisons, and the police, all with elaborate detail and indiscriminating minuteness, but never once shows a real grasp of her subject—or a judgment to be depended on; never makes any statement which on her independent authority can be trusted. The real under-current of Parisian life is hidden from her. She knows nothing, or at least tells nothing, of the hopes, the motives, the secret machinery which guide and influence the masses. She relates nothing but what she has been told. She has seen nothing but what she has been shown. She has formed no opinion but by permission of her prejudices. She never swerves from the prime motive of her labours—to prove everything better in Paris than London. The institutions of Paris are better managed than ours, its government more effectual, its police more ubiquitous, its thieves more full of resource, its soldiers better men, its youth more docile, its life more religious, its dead better cared for. And everything is proved with the greatest ease in the world. A mode of argument is adopted common enough with us all, but never pushed to so *naïve* an extreme as in this instance. Her plan is to prove her assertions (and our authoress never asserts anything without proof) by the statements of the friends of the institutions she likes, and by the enemies of those she hates; by the representations of the conductors and directors of French systems, and the avowed accusers and detractors of English ones. If anybody for any purpose has ever said the word she wants to be said, it does without further inquiry. Thus, for instance, she says that there is no case known of starvation in Paris, whereas it is notorious that 3,292 persons have died from want of the necessities of life within ten years in London. Indeed she would insinuate this wholesale mortality to be constantly raging round us, for, addressing her English readers and reminding them of their comforts, she makes this appeal,—

'Which of us, thus pillowed, ever pictured to himself the fact that at that very moment hundreds, nay thousands (for it is the *majority* of our fellow-beings), in the same town—maybe, some in the same street—are denuded of the barest necessities, and penetrated with cold to the very bones?—that if housed at all, they are shivering and quaking under the influence of fatigue, want, and hunger, in a bare and naked room?'—*Realities of Paris Life*, Preface viii.

She describes the Paris *gamins* by anecdotes and national boasts of their cleverness, our London boys by the police reports. She contrasts our rogues with their honest men, the speeches of our counsel defending a prisoner with the judgment

of a French judge laying down the law. Both are alike assumed to be deliberate expressions of opinion and tests of national morals. Looking over an *œuvre* in Belgium for the deaf and dumb, and full of admiration for the *Sœurs*' success, she quotes without hesitation the assertion of somebody that in our Kent-road Asylum (which by the way we know to be most carefully and successfully conducted, and with constant attention to religious instruction)—

'The result of their system shows them to be unaccountably savage and vicious, mischievous and deceitful, quarrelsome and unkind to one another, and oblivious and ungrateful towards their masters and superiors.'—*Flemish Interiors*, p. 116.

A single statement from any quarter exonerates her from all responsibility. Thus it is obvious that our clergy do not visit the sick, because Archbishop Whately (so she says, and, as we believe, untruly says) has said something which bears another construction.

'While the duty and the happiness of the Catholic priest consists in comforting and administering to the sick and dying, to whom this world can no longer offer consolation, the Protestant minister is actually *forbidden by ecclesiastical authority* (*vide* Charge of Richard Whately, Archbishop of Dublin) to approach such of his parishioners as are attacked by infectious diseases, alleging that the sick-bed—and therefore worst of all the death-bed—is no place for such ministry. "Their business is to preach the Gospel." Of course, his Grace ought to know; far be it from us to call in question so exalted an authority.'—*Realities of Paris Life*, vol. ii. p. 260.

For once, on occasion of a splenetic allusion to Miss Nightingale, authorities fail her altogether, and she talks without them. It is where she speaks of the *ovation* that welcomed that lady's return; whereas the point of the story is the simple modest dignity by which Miss Nightingale contrived to have no ovation at all, and to steal back to her country and to private life without anybody knowing.

'No "special correspondent" noted their [the Sisters' of S. Vincent de Paul] individual—no, nor yet their collective—exertions; no newspaper praise seconded their deeds or lauded their endurance; no ovation welcomed their return; no subscriptions were raised on their behalf; no hospitals will be erected in their honour, or named after their names; and no sovereigns invited them to their palaces or decorated them with ornaments of gold and precious stones. Oh no! *they* are too ambitious to be satisfied with such rewards as these; a perishable monument of stone will not suffice to satisfy their upward longings.'—*Ibid.* p. 267.

This strain does not prevent her relating with approbation, in another place, how the celebrated *Sœur Rosalie* was invested with the Cross of the Legion of Honour by the Emperor and Empress, who paid a visit to her own *quartier* to enhance the distinction. But we are always in the wrong

with those whose line of action has made it necessary to a restless conscience to prove us so. Even while this writer apologises for the Parisian desecration of Sunday, she is careful to prove that our observance does us no good; indeed, comparing our purlieus and low haunts with their places of highest resort, she proves there is little difference on this point between the two cities, and condenses our Sunday observances, in the words of the *Times* (whose columns she largely quotes from), to 'listening to noisy charity children on part of the seventh day after buying and selling during the remaining six.' All our newspaper catalogues of crimes and offences are brought up against us. The authoress acknowledges to piles of such documents lying before her, as she writes—

'Our readers would, we are sure, be as much astonished as ourselves at the large collection we have before us of misdemeanours for which these gentlemen (in this case it is the British soldier who is under review) are responsible. They comprise "brutal outrages," "daring attempts at desertion," "fatal military affrays," "sergeants robbing recruits," "burglaries," "robberies," "swindlings," and "midnight freaks at the barracks," &c., &c.'—*Ibid.* vol. ii. p. 222.

When England is described by its police reports and France is portrayed in a series of friendly inspections made for the occasion, we are not likely to come at much real appreciation of either country. The idea of such an estimate could only have occurred to a mind divested of the ordinary powers of perception; but it cannot fail to tell on the side she favours, for the French carefully observe the advice of their national proverb and wash their *linge sale en famille*, while we perform all those processes in ostentatious publicity. As we see no trace in these pages of an independent exercise of judgment, it betrays the feeling of the Church party in Paris, which manages these things, and with which the authoress is associated, that there are constant sneers and insinuations against a free press. It seems to us a short-sighted policy to identify religious, or rather Church, progress with the career of the present Emperor; but we see that he is defended in every act and principle by the working, active clergy, whom she has been among. One would think that M. de Montalembert by his long and energetic services had earned himself some claim on the affections and sympathy of the Church in France, but at the time of his trial this lady is anxious to prove that nobody in Paris cared about him, his cause, or his persecution.

'In Paris public opinion, no less than public conduct, is subject to the control of the police; and, accustomed as we are to a press which is *allowed* a great deal of liberty and takes a great deal more. . . . To cite a case in point, it could not but have struck the English minds of all British visitors in Paris as a startling "reality" that the French papers should, one

and all, appear on the morning following M. de Montalembert's trial, without one word of comment on a subject, which, from various causes, had excited so general an interest, and yet the result, it must be admitted, proves the wisdom of the measure; the subject, which would of course have been canvassed and discussed by the readers of the different journals, according to the view taken by the one each happened respectively to patronise, dropped at once into oblivion, and though the question of M. de Montalembert's condemnation was remaining actually pending, awaiting the appeal, so entirely had it ceased to occupy the public mind, that it may be said to have died a natural death almost immediately after its birth.

'While the English journalists—delighted with a new subject to fill their leaders during the dull season—were wearing out their pens and exhausting their brains in desperate efforts to say something bright and striking in the "mare's nest" they had found; not only were the papers in Paris occupied with anything and everything else, but even private opinion was silent on the subject. The masses had not even heard of it; the upper classes—unless of the party—were perfectly indifferent to it; and the clergy had no opinion on the matter, one way or the other. One priest, to whom we happened to speak of the affair, answered with a shrug, "Ma foi! nous n'y pensons même pas."—*Ibid.* vol. iii. p. 31.

Many of her details show amongst the hard-workers, the practical people who carry out the *bons œuvres* she describes, an excessive fear of general enlightenment and diffusion of ideas, a desire to keep things quiet, to preserve a calm surface, which accounts for their sympathy with the present Government, which is, in fact, a sympathy with the principle of suppression and keeping under. It is a time when the clergy are allowed a greater liberty, so to say, and it is only natural that where people are free themselves, they should not be very keenly alive to other people's bondage. 'With the 'religious liberty,' she writes, 'which has been restored to France, we find the Church once more beginning to act 'with vigour. Societies and associations are formed; vicious 'and profligate neighbourhoods are examined into.' Under this apparent prosperity the clergy are evidently willing to play into the Emperor's hands, and to assist him in the especial means by which his power is to be preserved. In their *œuvres* for the soldiers, which provide for their amusement as well as instruction, no newspaper is ever allowed in the *salle de jeux*, neither is a word on politics ever dropped, directly or indirectly, in their presence. In the *œuvres* for chimney-sweeps, they are not taught to read, and we cannot but suspect that the author's comment on this omission is derived from those who carry out the good work.

'None of them can even read; perhaps there is no great harm in this. It is a bold thing to say in these days of "progress," but we honestly think it might not be amiss if this deficiency were more general. Unhappily, among the lower orders, knowledge is oftener abused than used.'—*Ibid.* vol. i. p. 132.

Church and Government alike dread a sense of independence ; and the means which Power uses are found very efficient and available helps for the System which undertakes to think for all its members. In reward for such services we have anecdotes recorded, full of French unction, and very much in the pattern of the old tales of the first Napoleon, representing the Emperor in the most generous and amiable light, rewarding merit, succouring distress, redressing wrongs, and acting in all these functions under the joint inspiration of the Carmelite convent, and 'Notre Dame des Victoires.' First, we have the suppliant vaguely promised the patronage of some great personage, and exclaiming, 'If this personage be a man, I will 'entreat him as I should entreat God; if a woman, I will 'invoke her as I would invoke the Blessed Virgin.' Next, there is the scene in the camp; the Emperor summons the expectant private—

"Bernardet!" "Présent, mon Empereur," replied the soldier, throwing himself into the prescribed attitude. "Advance, my friend. You wrote to me about three weeks ago?" "Yes, Sire." "To commend your father to my notice?" "Yes, Sire." "A brave old soldier, who nobly served his country six-and-twenty years?" "Yes, Sire." "Very well, I will do something for him; in the meantime, hand him this little remembrance from me." Saying this, he slipped ten Napoleons into Bernardet's hand, as he stood motionless, and, as it were, magnetised by emotion and joy.—Vol. ii. p. 251.

Under this particular state of feeling, the French army is an especial object of interest to our authoress, who shows a true blind feminine tenderness for the military profession in every branch. 'In Catholic countries,' she observes, 'and certainly in France, we are struck by that analogy so universally observed 'in all ages between the military and spiritual combatant. Both 'are looked upon as the friends of humanity indiscriminately.' And she goes on to prove how superior the French soldier is to the British one. First, though many of her own indirect statements go against the view, she assumes that on the question of religious feeling there can be no comparison instituted between the French and English soldier, and proves this by the widest assertions; as that the conscripts of Brittany—'that land of faith 'and of fidelity—are generally proof against evil counsel and bad 'example:' or by a few exceptional anecdotes, as of the deathbeds and last sayings of soldiers and officers in the Crimea, or by the fact of a Zouave turning Trappist. Indeed these dear Zouaves, 'brave, dauntless fellows,' are her prime favourites, whether Trappist or not; in every respect they are delightful. She can forgive the *gamins* the follies of youth, when she reflects that they often turn Zouaves in the end. In regard to such excellent results she excuses the practice of conscription,

and prefers it to our system of enlistment, as insuring necessarily a superior class. Their compulsory service of seven years seems with her only to lead to a glorious career, and the possibility of the highest distinctions. Mr. Bayle St. John's observation of the system speaks a different language, certainly more in harmony with experience and probability.

'A fact that must be borne in mind, if we would understand what takes place in France, is, that in every twenty years at least a million and a half of men are restored from the army to the plough or other occupations, for the most part tainted with laziness and licentiousness. I quote the following account from a French writer, rather an optimist than otherwise, who published under the reign of Louis Philippe :—

"Look," says M. Alletz, "at the soldier just freed from service; he spends before his departure, in some coarse pleasures, the money which he has received from home to enable him to return. Reduced to pawn a portion of his garments to supply the deficiency thus created, he reaches his native place half naked, drooping with fatigue and hunger. In a few days is exhausted the natural joy he feels at finding himself among his friends again. Accustomed to the excitement of danger, if he have been in the field, or to the vagabond indolence which he leads in great cities during a long peace, he soon feels a heavy and a brutal *ennui*. Everything is strange and monotonous to him; the tranquillity of the country contrasts with his old habits; the uniformity of the life which he is compelled to lead, wearies him; used as he is to perpetual change, the solitude of the village gives no scope to his loquacity; the necessity of work alarms his indolence; even his newly-acquired liberty embarrasses a character broken in by discipline; he misses the public places of the cities; *ennui* makes him irritable and hard; he seeks out companions in arms and idleness; gets drunk with them; quarrels, grieves or drives his family to despair; shortens the days of his mother; becomes an evil example to youth, excites the indignation of all respectable people, is a cause of affliction and dishonour to his family, and disturbs the repose of the magistrate. It is a sad thing to say, but it is too frequent to find soldiers among the greatest criminals."—*Purple Tints*, vol. ii. p. 225.

Our authoress, however, hears of the soldier while still under discipline, and in the state to be worked upon—*penetrated*, to use her French phrase—with principles of religion. And viewing him through the organization for his instruction sanctioned by the Emperor, through the labours of the *œuvres militaires*, and of course of their successes, the vast mass which is not influenced at all, which succumbs under the enormous temptations of a soldier's life, passes from her recollection, and she comes to the conclusion that on the whole the French army is the most religious class in France. But every class with her, brought absolutely and by whatever means under the influence of an *œuvre*, and seen through that medium, assumes an interest of which we could not complain if it did not lead to injurious comparisons. She is great on prisons and reformatories, in which those that live are reformed with suspicious ease;—those that die, die 'in the best dispositions.' When

our jail chaplains modestly hope there is evidence 'that the Gospel is the power of God even in a prison,' she would like to *see* that evidence; but when the chaplain of a French military prison points out to her one of his charges as 'un vrai petit saint,' 'C'est un charmant enfant que je confessais hier, et qui est d'une piété angélique,' she accepts the praise implicitly as evidence of a great work, and a token of the power of faith in the speaker. As characteristic of the authoress's own style—distinguished from the compound of French idiom, dry statistics, and newspaper phraseology which makes up much of this work; as a trait too of that low social morality that does not scruple to report private conversation, which we sometimes see to accompany an habitually unfair line of thought and feeling—we extract some part of a scene she represents to have passed at a dinner-table at which she was present. We do not know whether it had best be true or not for the writer's credit. Why the *white* waistcoat should be an unmistakable sign of an English clergyman we do not know, nor yet how a jail chaplain should be so bright a cynosure to young ladies. To have clean teeth and hands we can quite believe is a disqualification after a familiar experience of French Capucins. It throws a suspicion over the whole story; and we may perhaps exculpate the lady of any real breach of the laws of hospitality by assuming the whole *mise en scène* to be a mere fancy sketch.

'Let not our readers charge us with prejudice, or want of charity, till they have perused the following episode, which we make no apology for introducing here, though we hope and believe the case is, in most respects, exceptional.

'It is not very long since—seated at the table of a friend, round which were assembled twelve or fourteen guests—we found ourselves placed opposite a gentleman whose dress and general appearance betokened the fact that he was in "holy orders." His coat was of the blackest, while his waistcoat and neckcloth were of dazzling brilliancy, in fact, they rivalled the whiteness of his teeth, and we had almost added, of his hands—in themselves an advertisement for Morris's almond paste, with which doubtless they had been softened and scented.

'His manner of speaking was slow, deliberate, dignified, of the Shaftesbury school; his age might be five-and-forty, and he was decidedly too old for the young lady who sat next to him, but who looked upon him with an interest inspired, in all probability, by his "holy calling." During dinner it was elicited that our friend was not only a "reverend," but a prison chaplain; and the conversation having turned upon the subject of a remarkable case, the principal actor in which had been recently executed, the "man in black," as Oliver Goldsmith has it, remarked, in a somewhat supercilious tone, and delicately passing his white hands one over the other: "I had him under my care after his condemnation." "Indeed!" interrupted a naval officer at our left; "and, pray, how did he behave after he came under your notice? It must be a strange position for a man to feel himself in." "Ah!—well—a—he was very indifferent—to every-

thing that ought to have interested him," replied the prison chaplain, evasively shaking his head almost as suggestively, and much more ominously, than Lord Burleigh. "Well, I'm always interested in these cases, somehow," said the other, in his blunt, honest manner; "what *did* he do?" "He—a—well, he wasn't—he wasn't at all—impressed with his position," said the first; and finding himself pushed, he proceeded in the same slow and hesitating tone, &c. &c.

'Mr. P——,' the criminal, received the chaplain's first advances coldly, whether in the form of personal attendance or the offered loan of a book.

"And then?" inquired the officer, who was listening attentively to the recital. "Why," stammered the reverend gentleman, who did not quite relish this unexpected cross-examination, and began to feel rather taken aback; "Why—I—a—I don't know; I never saw him again; I felt it was a hopeless case, and so—and so—I left him."

The lady of the house, feeling for the confusion of her guest, adroitly turns the conversation to watering-places, card-parties, county balls, equestrian pic-nics, shooting excursions, in all of which we are to assume our jail chaplain played an important and leading part, the means for such expensive aristocratic pleasures being abundantly supplied to him by the stipend of his office. The writer keeps a sharp look-out on salaries, and grudges the labourer his hire, with an asperity of economy when that labourer is a 'Protestant.'

In juxtaposition, and therefore in contrast, with this incident is related a striking story of an execution not long ago at Ghent. The mode of vouching for the authenticity of her facts is characteristic, 'it must be true, because she has seen and conversed with the actor in it,' the *aumônier de prison*, whose zeal, according to this narrative, was worthy a better success, though we think a finer tact and discernment would have suggested some remission of importunities.

'He wore a dark brown habit, of coarse thick cloth, confined round his waist with a cord, and his hood was thrown back upon his shoulders. His feet were bare, and his whole aspect betokened the man of self-denying asceticism.

'Unhappily the prisoner was a hardened villain; deaf to the words, to the prayers, to the persuasions of the father, he stopped his ears, he turned away his head, he refused to be instructed, to be reclaimed, to be comforted; he blasphemed and he cursed. The "Recollet" was obliged after a time to retire, but it was only to return to the charge. Every hour he would come to see if there was no change in the unhappy man, and each visit was to prove a fresh disappointment. . . . The whole day and night (previous to the execution) was passed in the condemned cell, either in earnest entreaties to the prisoner to listen to him, or in earnest prayer to God to turn his heart, but alas! all in vain. The "Recollet" declared his determination not to leave him, and when the officials appeared to make the last preparations he was still by his side. The gloomy procession wended its way to the place of punishment, the "Recollet" father still

walking by the culprit's side, and receiving from him nothing but imprecations and blasphemies. At last the scaffold is reached and the prisoner is handed over to the executioner; his hands are bound, his eyes are covered, a few minutes more and all will be over; his strength is failing him, but see, he makes a convulsive sign to the poor "Recollet" to approach. "Thank God!" ejaculates the holy man; "He has heard my prayers, and my perseverance has been rewarded." He approaches eagerly. "Oh but for an act of contrition, *even now!* through the merits of our dear Lord he will not perish." He approaches his ear to the mouth of the murderer, eager to catch the long-desired accents—but what is his horror, when the wretch, uttering a loud curse, spits in his face! At this fearful termination of all his hopes, nature yielded, the poor priest fainted, and was borne to his monastery, where a brain fever of some weeks' duration became his reward for the devoted spirit in which he had offered his labours of love."—Vol. iii. 216.

We would not dispute the point that the organization of the sister Church has its striking effects, and at any rate seeming points of advantage. All the great events of life and society, for joy or sorrow, are illuminated there by an appropriate light and colouring. Religion as seen in observances, as interposing in exciting or poignant moments, has a body, a visible existence, which impresses the universal heart. We doubt on our part if the most virulent Protestants that ever lived can fairly get away from its influence. Let them only see it, not here, where it looks out of place and unnatural, but in its acknowledged home, and some feature of the vast system will strike a chord, and awaken a sense of sympathy and of brotherhood. But this admission, after all, tells for very little. The sentiment 'as we mean it' is only a sentiment, and is compatible with strange lengths of positive unbelief. No one can read modern French literature without being aware that the French of this day are more 'Catholic' than Christian; that a sentimental regard for ceremonies, and even habits of thought, survives definite, distinct belief. A Frenchman is in a sort of way proud of his Church, whether he believes in it or not, whether he respects its clergy or not. It is a point of honour with him to assume that it is the best exponent of Christianity that exists. Of course a Frenchman's Christianity must be the best; the national gift of acumen and intelligence will preserve him from every avoidable error. Even such writers as George Sand assume that their country's Romanism is synonymous with Christianity, and she betrays now and then a regard for its peculiar privileges entirely at variance with the unbelieving tone of what is called her philosophy, and irrespective of the principle from which the privileges gain their worth. How to reconcile doubt on the very question of a future state with jealous clinging to the last sacraments, we do not know. We only see that it is natural,

and that persons who boast that our life ends with our last breath, and who live accordingly, hold the priests to their last offices with superstitious punctiliousness. The most notorious unbelievers make a decorous ending, and their fellow unbelievers are glad that they do. From assuming that it is either Romanism in every article, or atheism, some of them come to think it the Church and atheism. Mr. Bayle St. John quotes an abbé, who relates how he once met a man in the fields who hastened to inform him, as if it were an interesting fact, that he believed 'neither in heaven nor in hell.' On being mildly expostulated with, he grew warm, and began to attack the clergy, saying among other fine things, 'Those gentlemen in black tried to persuade us that Voltaire would not be admitted into Paradise. But when he presented himself at the gates, S. Peter opened them back on their hinges, and ushered him in with a bow.' His own large experience of Frenchmen who profess materialism, and live after its principles, leads this author to the conviction that this anecdote illustrates the mental state of most who affect this unhallowed creed. In another place, he relates the system by which a 'poor bachelor' contrives with 20*l.* a year to lead a life of pleasure. It is a picture evidently drawn from the life, and concludes:—

'Mr. F—— looks upon the whole world as a medium in which his enjoyments are to take place; whether he has any suspicion of anything beyond, I know not. If we may believe what he says, he "jumps the life to come," and sees no difference between his own destiny and that of a dog. However, he has some superstitions:—attributed an accident on board a steamer from S. Cloud to the presence of a priest; trembles if salt be upset on the table-cloth; will not give or receive a knife as a present, and is indignant with the clergy who refuse the offices of the Church to the impenitent dead.'—*Purple Tints*, vol. ii. 249.

This disposition is likely to have a very telling effect on minds represented by our authoress. Observing a show of respect, hearing of no dissent, these things assume a unity which in reality means nothing. When the present writer sat down to a *table d'hôte* in France, and saw the Frenchmen present all eating meat on Friday, she presumes they were all provided with dispensations, so resolutely did she cherish the notion of an unbroken communion of saints; and every, the slightest, outward conformity is accepted in the same undoubting spirit. To such thinkers our English Church would gain in unity if all 'our dissenting brethren' were to shut up their meeting-houses and turn sceptics. When they dissent in Paris, they do it with a vengeance. But it is a way to make them indifferent to questions of form and order; they have no temptation to set up a visible counter ideal.

Since the *coup d'Etat* there is no doubt that the aspect of things in Paris shows more of the Church's work, that it has really become a more conspicuous element. All parties are agreed to the fact of its vastly increased influence on education; the Jesuits have now an immense number of establishments under them, in which they jealously infuse their own views on history and science, as well as religion. All these undertakings, *œuvres* and other institutions, are a feature that should count more among the great conspicuous facts of Paris than they have done of late years. But what this writer aims to prove from the pile of details indiscriminately heaped together, is that the mass of Parisians are more under religious influence than the same mass in London. Now the greater part of the works she details are missions—missions engaged upon the poor and destitute or disgraced classes. The compact rank of middle life is never touched upon by her, the class with us most under religious and moral influences, and which gives the tone to the English character. Authorities who speak from experience attribute to this class in Paris a tone in both religion and morals below the fellow class in England. This is not a question of prisons or police, which only interfere with the lower order of offenders against morals; it cannot be settled by statistics. It is a matter of experience and close discerning observation. The work before us does not touch on the moral state of the French middle classes, and therefore can give us no real idea of the present state of Paris. The plan is to answer the charges which have been brought against the bulk of Parisian society by counter-charges against a lower class in London, which, of course, renders the attempt at comparison futile. She will, for instance, boast the superior order observed in public places of amusement for the lowest classes, in Paris contrasted with London. Personally, we do not suppose her in a position to judge; but we find her repeating what others have said—

‘Whether from fear of God, or simply from fear of the police, we do not pretend to say, but the amusements of the lower classes, such as penny theatres, penny dancing-saloons, music-halls, &c. are tame, prudish places of resort, and not comparable for “fun” (and impropriety) with those gaffs and casinos nightly *ignored* in Whitechapel, Finsbury, and Holborn, ay, and much nearer the West End than that. . . . We know, from personal investigation, that the *salons de danse*, à 10c. *pour le cavalier et sa dame*, even *hors barrière*, are perfectly harmless; and whether as regards propriety of dress or conduct, far less open to censure than many a fashionable ball-room in the squares of London.’—*Realities of Paris Life*, Preface, p. v.

Has this lady visited the Jardin Mabille? If she has, and dares to say that such a place stands in favourable comparison to anything in England, we have nothing to say for her or to

her. If she has not visited it, she has no right to speak on the subject. But we may say more. No mention is made of those more brilliant scenes of Parisian dissipation constantly open, but which culminate to a point of frenzy at carnival time in the masked ball at the opera: too expensive for the poor on their own account, and of which we read, 'I saw 'at the opera, and have seen at other places, men whom 'the world could scarcely conceive present at such scenes, not 'merely spectators, but joining in all the mad enjoyment of 'the occasion,—laughing, talking worse than nonsense, flirting, 'and even dancing—or rather gesticulating—like mad men 'and fools as they all were for the moment,' and there were women of the same rank looking on. We are not going to enter into the details needed to prove the point of a low moral standard in the *bourgeoisie* of Paris. We only say it is commonly said, and not contradicted here. Let anybody compare the moral cast of the middle classes as displayed in the parallel satires and caricatures of the Paris *Charivari* and the London *Punch*, and he will get a fair estimate of the relative character of French and English life. These 'Realities of Paris' give us but a one-sided idea of life there, and send us elsewhere for impressions to be relied on. Even in the picture of the lower classes it is the same; their, morals, their habits of thought, their domestic arrangements, are scarcely hinted at except to magnify the *œuvres* at work to counteract them. Every social abuse and sin among ourselves is paraded: child-murder, flogging in the army, maltreatment of lunatics; and everything that the newspapers bring to light, from a dead body discovered, to a letter treacherously opened (she considers this last a practice peculiar to our Government), is raked up as though an *œuvre* might prevent them, as though indeed they were distinctly national characteristics, which justify the loss of the patriotic sense, observable in more instances than the present one. These pages are furious against the leniency of our juries, and charge the nation with infanticide; a charge easily retorted where there are so many parents who cast off the charge of their children, indifferent whether they live or die.

All our attempts at reformation and amendment are ridiculed and despised. If a man, not a *frère*, devotes himself to teaching children, he is a *gaping* Englishman, and the children are stupid children; if an Englishwoman, not a *sœur*, interests herself for the suffering, she is twitted with Exeter Hall, with bazaars and charity-balls, indiscriminately; and called names, 'sentimental' and 'evangelical.' Indeed, nothing is more striking than the profound ignorance discernible in these pages, and in persons of similar temper and views, of the real work that is going on in

England; all that is involved in the parish system, when carried out; the simple charities, the constant unostentatious intercourse for instance that goes on between an active English Churchwoman and the poor within her reach and influence. This ignorance certainly excuses our suspicion, that previous to her change of religion this lady had not made herself acquainted, either by practice or observation, with the condition of the poor of this country, or the bearing of our Church towards them. There is something in the tone and manner of detailing cases of destitution and visits of investigation which implies no previous practice in visiting, no disinterested experience of the habits, requirements, and sufferings of the poor. The impression sought to be conveyed, that the poor are always in extremity of destitution, that every one who sallies forth to assist them will have his feelings harrowed by naked and famishing children, huddled together before dying embers, all shows the absence of calm practical acquaintance with the subject. It is acquired partly from printed statements of destitution, partly from a desire to enhance the merit of labours in her adopted Church, which do not need these highly coloured adornments, and which, we believe, the practical, really experienced 'sisters' themselves would hardly sanction or recognise as a just picture. We do not mean that in large cities there is not a grievous amount of extreme want,—our papers call attention to it as every winter comes round,—but it is an outrage on Providence, as well as on fact, to assume that utter destitution is everywhere the normal condition of a large section of mankind. Perhaps the country of this lady's preference may encourage the tone of feeling; at any rate she recommends herself to French readers by it, for we are told by one who knows Paris well—

'When the French visit England, their first care is to hasten to Bethnal Green or Whitechapel, to gloat over the misery there to be found. In a sort of vague, dreamy form, the information collected by our Sanitary Commissioners has been carried over to France, where it causes the breasts of all true patriots to swell with delight, on the same principle that we might be pleased at finding that one of our enemies was afflicted with a cancer. The French keep their eyes so fixed upon our cancers that they fancy us all cancer.'—B. ST. JOHN'S *Purple Tints*, vol. i. p. 105.

It is possible that the organization of their own destitution may make it seem to the French less a blot. Our authoress devotes a great deal of space and descends to infinite minutiae in describing the class of *chiffonniers*, a body of 6,000 strong, who have their rules, their *esprit de corps*, and their own hotels, their clubs, so to say; men and women who live by scraping among dust-heaps, and some of them, poor unfortunates, by eating the offal that they find there. It is not in the English nature to

organize such misery, or to be otherwise than misanthropical under it. The good and the bad in us render it alike impossible, as in their case their cheerful adaptation to circumstances and their hopeless facility of *sinking* after a certain pass accounts for it. It is notorious that this miserable band which carries the *hotte*, the *crochet*, and the lantern, numbers among its members families of the *ancienne noblesse*. We read of one who, on being asked what o'clock it was, answered by a quotation from Horace. The present writer says:—

‘Every one in Parisian society a few years ago, would have remembered a distinguished officer, whose lofty and intelligent air, and noble demeanour at the head of his regiment were at that time the theme of general admiration. A few years more, and he was to be seen divested of every distinction; his frame bent, his gait listless, his step tottering, as he walked feebly along with the help of a stick. His cheek was pallid and sunken, his brow furrowed, and only shaded by a few straggling grey hairs, while his eye, once so quick and beam-
ing, was now hollow and meaningless. His garments—evidently never made for him—were tattered and dirty, his hat was bent and brimless, his feet were seen through his torn and shapeless boots. How could so sad a metamorphosis have come about? alas, it was the old story—general revolution and individual ruin. Adversity had been at work; discouragement followed loss of position; self-respect was annihilated, and little by little he became what he now is—a wandering *chiffonnier*.’

‘Among the families of the *ancienne noblesse* who have sought in Paris a hiding-place in these hovels, is one which must be known to many; it is that of the Comte de M——, one member of whose family was an *avocat-général* under Charles X. This portion of it consisted of father, mother, son and daughter, and the wife’s brother, also of noble lineage. When they first left their province to come to Paris, they still possessed from the wrecks of their property some few relics of their original splendour, which they brought with them to the great capital. . . . Some were sold to meet the demands of daily expenditure, others were seized as security for rent they were unable to pay. Their destitute owners were driven from lodging to lodging, each being inferior in calibre to the last, and were at length compelled to take up their abode in a cellar to which access could only be gained by a ladder under the street. In this subterranean cavern lived this once honoured family. Misery and despondency the most profound, and demoralisation of a character scarcely conceivable, poisoned the very air they breathed. The interior of this den was calculated to strike consternation into the hearts

'of those who visited it. The men had a wild and alarming expression, which was not diminished by the unshorn and unkempt state of their beards and hair. . . . At length the father betook himself to the *hotte* and the *crochet*; he lived the life, and ate the fare, and kept the hours of the Paris *chiffonnier*. But he grew rapidly old under the effort; his senses became more deadened, and he seemed to be reduced to a mere living machine. One day he was picked up, as he returned from his day's work, in a state of complete stupefaction, by the Petites Sœurs, who conveyed him to their asylum. Under their fostering benevolence he partially regained his senses, and with them some faint traces of his once refined features. He died under their care—reconciled to his fate and to God.'—*Realities of Paris Life*, vol. i. p. 319.

It may be the tendencies we see at work in deterioration like this, in this facility of descent, that led the republican M. de Toqueville to maintain that his countrymen have so great an affinity with the savage, that 'when brought in contact with wild tribes they degenerate towards them instead of elevating them.' In other instances we read of the same fall as more cheerfully borne; though the degradation and loss of refinement is the same, the spirit of making the best of things still remains.

But if the French can be cheerful under the reverses of fortune, much more in voluntary privation; their cheerfulness, their liveliness of mind, in the midst of the self-denying labours this book so zealously records, is the impression which takes place of all others. The vivacity of exclamation (oaths we should call them in English) with which these pious people inaugurate their conversation on the most serious subjects, gives a perpetual sense of careless jollity, and lightens to our own feelings the weight of austerities which seem the heavier (as it would appear) because we do not share them.

In all that we have said reflecting on the tone of this writer towards the country and Church of her birth, we have desired carefully to discriminate. Her praise of the good works so zealously carried on in Paris is good so far as it is dictated by a genuine candid admiration; but when repeated merely to set off and enhance systematic disparagement of England, it raises suspicion, and must be accepted with caution. Where a person sees only good in one system of action and only evil in another, both alike having at heart the service of God and our neighbour, both alike subject to human infirmity and shortcomings—where she estimates one by its intentions, the other by its failures, it is very certain that the facts on both sides will need sifting. The book is curious mainly as the work of a convert—or *pervert* shall we call it in this instance, where so much wilful per-

versity and obliquity of judgment is apparent?—and exhibits in broad colours the dangers incident to a change of faith, founded, as far as these writings show, on hasty or insufficient or external grounds—a change supported by prejudice and justified by misrepresentation. Those who read with the caution which the whole style and tone readily prompt, will find many of the details valuable, the facts interesting, and the various schemes and efforts, elaborately particularised, deserving of all respect and admiration for the motives which instigated them, while not a few are worthy of direct imitation.

ART. VII.—1. *Journal of Convocation*. 1854—1858. Rivingtons.

2. *Liturgical Revision*. By the Rev. C. H. DAVIS. With an Introduction by Lord Ebury. Seeley, Jackson, and Halliday. 1859.

3. *Church Questions*. By the Rev. C. ROBINSON, LL.D. Hatchard and Co. 1859.

THE revision of the Prayer-book—is it, or is it not, desirable? is a question in itself most momentous, and, at the present time, of pressing importance. The maintenance of the Christian faith in its purity and completeness depends essentially on the authorised formularies of the Church. Therein are contained, expressly or implicitly, the great doctrinal truths of our religion. Thence is derived the practical and devotional character which is the growth and consequence of a real belief. Above all, if we keep in mind that the mode and manner of approaching the Divine Majesty in solemn worship is the question under consideration, we cannot but feel its paramount importance. At the present time, owing to a concurrence of causes, the proposal of revision occupies no small amount of attention, not among the clergy only, but among the laity also. In Parliament as well as in Convocation, though in very different senses, it has been gravely entertained. The time is come for those who desire the welfare of the Church in England to form an intelligent opinion, and to take a decided part for or against revision.

If it is always necessary in any discussion to define clearly and exactly the meaning of the terms that are used, it is especially so in regard to such a phrase as the revision of the Prayer-book. The words are familiar to our ears. They are bandied to and fro in casual conversation, in the columns of newspapers, in sketchy and superficial pamphlets; but their force and significance is lost in vague uncertainty. Many persons may be found advocating revision without knowing what they mean and what they want. Not only is there the widest possible difference of opinion on the kind and measure of change desired by different persons, who may seem at first sight to make common cause, but also and equally on the no less difficult question of the proper way of effecting it. On both points a dangerous confusion of ideas exists even among educated persons. The great distinctive truths embodied in the Prayer-book are, it must be owned, so insufficiently appreciated, and the proper position and office of the Christian Church have been so ignored and misapprehended, that much ignorance and many prejudices must

be removed before the subject can be treated fairly. It will be the aim and endeavour of the following remarks to clear the subject, so far as may be possible, of the manifold perplexities by which, in the minds of many persons, it is encumbered and embarrassed, and to consider a question so momentous calmly and dispassionately, without the bias of partisanship; regarding it in all its various bearings, and endeavouring to weigh justly the reasons which incline the scale to one side or the other.

Of course it must be admitted, on all hands, that the idea of revision, in the abstract, is not unreasonable. It would be an unwarrantable and indefensible assumption to maintain that the Prayer-book cannot, by any possibility, be amended. However excellent already, still, like everything else of human origin, it may be conceived more perfect than it is. The wise and holy men who compiled it were not infallible. Besides, as change is the law of all things earthly, it may need that sort of alteration which is meant by adaptation, in order to be translated, as it were, so as to suit the requirements of a new generation. So much as this may fairly be granted *in limine*. The idea of revision cannot be tabooed as preposterous. It can claim a hearing. But from this point begin the difficulties, as soon as the question is moved from the abstract to the actual—from what might be to what is. Are there really any serious faults of omission or commission in the book? Are they such as to justify incurring the risks always involved in change? Lastly, even if desirable *per se*, are these supposed amendments practicable at the present time?

There are three courses proposed. There is a doctrinal revision, desired, if not by Lord Ebury himself, at all events by some of his clients. There is the revision of a very different kind, which has been recommended by some of the most eminent members of both houses of Convocation; a revision which would preserve the Prayer-book as it is, while supplementing it with an Appendix of Services, composed by rearrangement of those already existing. Lastly, there are persons, of no less weight and authority, who deem it, on the whole, the safest course to keep the Prayer-book exactly as it is, and to rest content with it rather than to risk the dangers of any change.

The idea of any such revision of the Prayer-book as would alter its doctrinal character may be dismissed very summarily. It is simply an impossibility. The small section of clergymen whose petition is adopted and patronised by Lord Ebury, and who are in more ways than one represented by the gentleman whose significant name is Nihill, are strangely mistaken if they suppose that any change such as they desire would be tolerated by their brethren in the Ministry. There may be others who

would wish to see the alteration, if any, made in a diametrically opposite direction; who would like to see the Services of the English Church, if in any way altered, approximated, not towards the Genevan type, but towards that of the Greek and Roman Communions. But there is no likelihood of either change. A great overwhelming mass of the English clergy are unequivocally opposed to any such change at all. It is morally certain, that in the event of the Prayer-book being remodelled after the manner desired by Lord Ebury's petitioners, an immense majority of the clergy would simply adhere to their present Prayer-book, and refuse to recognise the new one, in spite of any penal consequences. But, in fact, it is inconceivable that any parliament, even one reformed on Mr. Bright's principles, could be so infatuated as to face such a national disruption as would ensue. Great and deplorable as is the ignorance and indifference on ecclesiastical matters even of professing churchmen among the laity, any aggression so tyrannical as the attempt to enforce a new Prayer-book on an unwilling clergy at the request of a minority unimportant as in numbers so in character and position, would be too reckless a violation of the rights of conscience. If ever a trial so severe should be allowed by the inscrutable wisdom of Providence to befall the English Church, men will not be wanting in thousands among the clergy to endure loss and suffering for the truth's sake. But those who agitate for a doctrinal revision ought to reflect on the consequences of what they are trying to do. In the vain and hopeless attempt to conciliate the Dissenters—vain and hopeless, for it is the *animus* of Dissent which puts and keeps men in that position, not this or that passage in the Prayer-book—they are taking the likeliest way to precipitate a schism in the English Church, and in all probability an abrupt severance of the ties which hold Church and State together. But, we repeat, there is no danger, provided that all those who are opposed to a doctrinal revision will take the trouble to make their sentiments known. Petitions ought to be presented from every Rural Deanery, signed by clergy and laity alike against it. Above all, the London Declaration, expressing the conviction 'that any such attempt, at the present time, 'would be fraught with great danger to the peace and unity of 'the Church,' ought to be endorsed by the clergy throughout all parts of the kingdom.' If the almost universal feeling of the clergy in favour of preserving the Prayer-book shall once make itself understood, the impending evil will, in all likelihood, be averted.

It is unnecessary here to enter into a vindication of the doctrines of the Prayer-book as it stands. That has been done,

¹ Signatures may be sent to G. H. Davies, Esq., 69, Lincoln's-Inn-Fields.

and done thoroughly, over and over again already. Received and transmitted from the earliest ages of the Christian Church, they have been assailed by some fresh cavil or objection in each succeeding age, and in each age they have been illustrated and enforced by the wisest, most learned, and holiest theologians. Suffice it to say now, in reply to the proposal for a new Prayer-book, that the clergy of England are decided in their conviction that such a thing *cannot be*.

But it may be answered that Lord Ebury disclaims any alteration of doctrines. That amiable and well-meaning nobleman is no doubt sincere in the disclaimer. But probably he is hardly aware where changes of doctrine begin. The Prayer-book is so permeated by the spirit of primitive Christianity; even in its minuter arrangements, it is framed and compacted so carefully on the type of older rituals; so often a great and cardinal principle is involved, if not expressed, by some traditional phrase, or some apparently trifling direction—that no ordinary learning and tact would be required to touch the Prayer-book at all without provoking a theological controversy. But, whatever may be Lord Ebury's intentions, it is easy to see in the two pamphlets, the titles of which are prefixed to these remarks (one of which is endorsed with his name), how delicate and dangerous an undertaking it would be to operate on the Prayer-book. Mr. Davis and his friends rush in where wiser persons would fear to tread. He steps boldly and complacently among the smouldering fires of controversy. His pamphlet is an example of the popular confusion of ideas on the subject. He gravely proposes, almost in the same breath, first, 'to revise the Prayer-book, without altering any doctrine in any direction,' and then, 'to alter those few points on which unhappy differences have arisen, according to the standard of the Thirty-nine Articles.' In this vague and hazy way men speak and think on a subject requiring such careful deliberation, such clearness of intellect, such learning, such profound spiritual wisdom, as the alteration of the Prayer-book. Mr. Davis seems happily unconscious of his inconsistency. Perhaps he would excuse himself on the ground that he asks not for the doctrines to which he takes objection to be directly negatived, but that they should be 'generalised,' and left open to be taken in either sense—either as affirmed or denied. But what is this but to expunge them? So expressed, or rather so denuded of all expression, the truth in question becomes lost by silence. '*De non apparentibus et non existentibus eadem est ratio.*' When you have subjected the Prayer-book to a process of this kind, eviscerating it of all its distinctive principles, erasing at the arbitrary dictation of each little clique of

sectaries, the peculiar doctrine, however precious to the hearts of others, which does not approve itself to their predilections,—what remains but a lifeless, inorganic residuum, void of form and colour, strangely unlike the clear and majestic outlines of Christian Truth which we have received as a precious legacy from our forefathers in the faith?

For the same reasons, the idea of leaving all the passages, to which exception can be taken, optional, to be used or not at each clergyman's private discretion, is equally inadmissible. Any such course would be simply tantamount to making two Prayer-books—one for those who adhere to the ancient formularies, one for dissentients. Two Books of Common Prayer in real, if not avowed, antagonism:—the one by implication, and in effect, if not in express words, a contradiction of the other! No. Any generalisation of the controverted passages so as to leave the doctrine which they convey no longer there, or any permission to substitute other forms in their stead, must be firmly and strenuously resisted, as equivalent in reality to a new Prayer-book, and equally certain to disquiet and disunite the Church.

It is simply chimerical to fancy that the Dissenters can be restored to the Church by tampering with the Prayer-book in this manner. No amount of concession to their prejudices, no mutilation of the Prayer-book, however ruthless, would satisfy the insatiable craving which is the animating principle of Dissent. If each sect had free liberty to pare away those parts of the Prayer-book to which it feels repugnance, the residuum would be almost nothing. If, besides, they were allowed, as they would not unnaturally expect, to introduce their own peculiar tenets, the result would be an incongruous and unintelligible patchwork. But in neither case would they be content. So long as ignorance and misconception prevail, so long as men's minds are swayed by self-will and self-conceit instead of by reverence and humility, there will still be Dissenters. No doubt there are always a certain number of Dissenters not by deliberate choice, but by accident—not by fault of their own, but owing to external causes. At the present time in this country a large proportion of Dissent is of this kind, not accountable for its own existence, the result of past neglect and of an overpowering increase of population. Dissenters of this kind may and will, with the Divine blessing, be restored to the fold, as the Church more and more zealously fulfils its mission. But they must come to the truth: it cannot be cut and fashioned to suit their fancy. The Christian faith is a sacred deposit committed to the Church, to be preserved whole and entire for all ages. The Church has no right to compromise it in any way by suppression of any part, in order

to please human preconceptions. The suppression of the truth is the same thing as the promulgation of error. The Church is bound by fidelity to our Divine Lord and Master to keep his truth unchanged, as it is in its own transcendent nature unchangeable, till the end of the world. But it is needless to insist on what must be evident to any thoughtful mind unwarped by party spirit. The utter futility of any such comprehension of Dissenters as we have been speaking of is plain even from the admissions of its most eager advocates. Mr. Davis, after enumerating the various and important alterations of doctrine which he recommends, is constrained to confess a misgiving, not only 'how far agreement could be secured to such alterations,' but 'whether or not they would satisfy, provided they could be obtained.' Dr. Robinson appears more sanguine as to the success of his scheme for the restoration of unity, but it is truly an extraordinary one. He proposes, with the utmost naïveté, that 'each denomination should prepare a service for themselves out of the Book of Common Prayer, omitting such prayers and canticles as they object to,' and then that this motley group of Prayer-books should all be sanctioned for the respective congregations by the Bishops of the Church! Dr. Robinson has certainly discovered a new way of promoting unity. If this be all which can be said in favour of the comprehension of Dissenters by altering the Prayer-book, the scheme will not gain many adherents. We repeat that dissentients must alter themselves to the Truth, it cannot be altered to them. The more clearly and unfalteringly the Church proclaims her heavenly message, the more distinctly she announces the spiritual blessings which she alone is commissioned to convey to mankind, the more likely it is that the wanderers may be recalled to her fold. It is mainly because men have become blind to the great truth that there is one only divinely-appointed way of salvation—one only channel for diffusing throughout the world the blessings which flow from the Cross—that so many have turned from the living waters to hew out shallow and soon-exhausted cisterns for themselves. Real unity among Christians is a priceless treasure; but the hollow delusion of professed union, without real unity, is not worth purchasing at any price, most certainly not at the cost of any sacrifice of the truth. First, and above all things, truth; next, and secondarily, peace, ought to be the desire of every Christian.

The pamphlets which have been already referred to are only valuable as indicating, with more precision than usual, the chief alterations in the Prayer-book which are demanded by those whom the authors may be supposed to represent. Dr. Robinson's fitness to pronounce an opinion on liturgical questions

may be estimated not only from his extraordinary panacea for dissent, which we have already mentioned, but from other passages in his pamphlet. In proposing to substitute a Collect from the Communion Service for the present Absolution, he prefixes to it a Rubric, directing the clergyman to 'stand up and pronounce this absolution.' There may be conceivable reasons why the priest should stand, as is customary in some other instances, while offering up this prayer, but how can saying a prayer by any possibility be called pronouncing an absolution? Mistakes like this show a fatal ignorance of the very simplest principles of divine worship. Again, in criticising the Ordination Service, he betrays a lamentable confusion in his mind even on so fundamental a part of the Christian faith as the office and operations of the Holy Ghost. He objects to the words 'Receive ye the Holy Ghost,' that they are out of place, inasmuch as the candidate for the priesthood has already professed his belief that he is inwardly moved by the Holy Ghost; as if the grace by which every good desire is stirred and fostered within the heart, and which is common to all Christians, were the same thing as the gift of spiritual power to exercise an holy office which is communicated by the laying on of hands in ordination. We are not now concerned to defend this service against its impugnors; we are merely instancing with what insufficient knowledge and indistinctness of ideas men venture to pronounce an opinion on the highest and most awful questions. In the same unconsciousness of what he is doing, he thinks that by 'leaving out some twenty-five words' here, and 'some thirty-five words' there (without considering how much would be involved by the omission of those few short sentences), the Prayer-book might be improved so as to give general satisfaction! Mr. Davis's theological knowledge and reasoning are of the same order. In endeavouring to impart a more 'Protestantistic' character, as he calls it, to the Prayer-book, he quotes largely from such sources as a Presbyterian Free Church Review, and other similar periodicals. He lays a great stress on the fact of the Prayer-book having been revised more than once already; as if that were not a 'raison de plus' for expecting, on 'à priori' grounds, that it does not require to be revised again. His argumentation throughout is not of a very solid texture, and will hardly succeed in convincing any but those who are beforehand determined to agree with him. We need not waste further time on brochures so crude and inconclusive as these. May the Prayer-book be saved from such manipulation as it would experience, if every one, qualified only by his opinion of his own competency, is to lay rash hands upon it.

It is no new thing in the history of the English Church, this

eager craving for change, combined with a slight and superficial theology. There has always been a section within the Church more considerable for zeal than for learning and discretion, not heartily sympathising with the traditional teaching of the Church, and more or less disposed to fraternise with the seceders from it. Not seldom in the last century men of high purpose and earnest devotion were inclined in this direction chiefly from the general apathy and indifference of those about them. But now, in the wakening energy of the Church, the case is changed. Every year gradually and insensibly draws men of this character, though born and bred amid the associations of Dissent or semi-Dissent, nearer and nearer to those who hold fast the received belief of the early Church. As time goes on, and as men of opposite parties come mutually to a better understanding, and learn to meet on common ground, it may confidently be hoped that old suspicions and prejudices will be dissipated, and the English Church present a more compact and united front against the heathenism and immorality that we have to contend with. The Formularies, as they are now, afford a bond of union which, without too closely circumscribing the instinctive tendencies of either party, holds both parties together, and facilitates their arriving in time at more perfect agreement. But this gradual approximation of high and low churchmen would be rudely stopped, and a yawning chasm would open itself between the two parties, if these Formularies were to be changed. Instead of blindly and restlessly grasping at a change which could only satisfy the one party by extruding the other, it were better to acquiesce in the providential dispensation which has given us a framework admitting some diversity of opinion on controverted points, with a strict regard to general orthodoxy of belief. At any rate, a time like the present is peculiarly ill-suited for revision.

The objections made to certain parts of the Prayer-book are often based on a misconception. Many persons form a distorted idea of the doctrine which they fancy intended, and waste their strength in fighting a shadow. It may be worth while to consider very briefly the chief points in controversy, in order to show how much nearer would be the unity of the Church, not if the passages in question were altered (for that, as we have shown, is out of the question), but if they were more clearly and duly understood.

It is a trite remark that the English Church allows a certain amount of latitude on controverted questions. But we must be careful as to the sense in which alone this remark is true. The latitude is not in regard to the objective truth in its own essential nature, but subjectively as to the precise manner of

expressing it. Invariably the mystery is enunciated, so plainly as to preclude mistake, in its great eternal outlines; but no attempt is made—hopelessly impossible as it always proves—to define rigorously and in set terms what must always remain beyond the reach of the human understanding. Let us take in order the chief points in dispute, and we shall see how much room there is for those differences of opinion which result necessarily from the diversities of human idiosyncrasies, without losing for a moment our firm grasp on the great substantial verities of Revelation. The interminable dispute on Predestination is left by our formularies logically undecided, without any attempt to solve what is insoluble, and to reconcile within the narrow limits of the human intellect the two apparently irreconcilable principles, each in itself practically true, of the Divine foreknowledge overruling all things on the one hand, and of man's perfect free agency on the other. So again on the doctrine of Sacramental grace. It is clearly stated, in terms of which men have been unable though desirous to evade the force, that in the one Sacrament the child is born again; and, in the other, that a Real Divine Presence consecrates the elements of bread and wine; but how this wondrous spiritual change is effected, and to what precise degree—in what way and how far the sinful nature is changed by the Baptismal waters, and fresh communication of life divine imparted in the Holy Eucharist—is left for the revelations of that time when we shall 'know as we are known.' In both cases the English Church recites the formula of Holy Writ, without presuming to dogmatise more exactly on its significance. A new birth in Baptism is indeed affirmed, as in Holy Scripture, so by the English Church; but men are not required to assent to any definition, how far the original nature of mankind is abolished, or how far it still remains to thwart and hinder the new life in the soul. Very often persons may be found objecting to Baptismal Regeneration, as if by the term was intended a belief that the soul is from Baptism actually rather than potentially sanctified. Similarly objection is made to the doctrine of the Real Presence, and to the spiritual sacrifice in the Holy Communion, as if assent were demanded to some logically impossible statement. But invariably the Church simply repeats the words of Him who is the Truth, and delivers them to the faithful believer unrestricted by the subtle refinements of dogmatic phraseology. There is no attempt to adapt to human reason what is of necessity above, though not contrary to, reason. So again in the Ordination Service it is not an uncommon mistake, as we have already seen, to suppose that the words, 'Receive ye the Holy Ghost,' imply the gift of some superior personal holiness,—

not, as they really do, the gift of the Holy Spirit for ministrations in the Church. If men would but realise distinctly the independence of the office and the person who holds it; if they would open their eyes to the fact that the messengers of Christ are merely messengers, not acting with inherent authority, but simply as ministers even in the most solemn exercise of their deputed powers; and that the message of blessing and pardon is entirely provisional, and conditional on the state of the heart in the eyes of the only all-seeing Judge; then they would cease to be scandalised, as they sometimes are now, at the doctrine of Absolution. Again, no subject has occasioned more acrimonious controversy than Private Confession. Here again the Church of England leaves a certain discretion as to the use of the ordinance. The principle is plainly sanctioned; the practical application of it is left, as in reason it ought, to be determined by circumstances. The popular outcry against Confession would not have been roused, if it had been clearly understood that Confession to a priest is not required in the Prayer-book as necessary in order to receive his message of forgiveness. For receiving advice and direction common sense shows that private confession is necessary; but for Absolution, repentance alone is requisite, which may evidently exist even where there is no confession.¹

In the same uncompromising, yet tolerant spirit, the Prayer-book speaks of Fasts and Feast-days, without imposing any minute regulations of diet. A wise liberty is allowed in the application of the principle to the cases of individuals. The scruples that are felt by some persons on both these points arise, as usual, from a misconception. Their scruples about so plainly scriptural a practice as Fasting would cease, if they would only look through what they choose to regard as a mere outward formality, to the deep evangelical principle of self-denial which underlies it; nor would they object to the observance of Saints' days, if they were brought to see that the honour paid in such observances is not paid to the faithful servants of Christ, but to Him from whom alone all their graces are derived.

Lastly, the scruples which some persons feel against the use of the Athanasian Creed would be removed, if they would but understand that what they erroneously call the damnatory clauses, are really and truly minatory; a warning such as Christian charity requires to be uttered, not a sentence of condemnation; and that even in this point of view an intentional, so to speak,

¹ We are not speaking here of the extraordinary cases for which a special Absolution is provided in the Prayer-book, but of the ordinary ministrations of forgiveness in the public services of the Church. Both the public Absolutions, though differing in form, alike convey pardon to the penitent.

not a formal or literal assent is implied by the words 'which except a man believe faithfully, he cannot be saved.'

Another point in the Prayer-book, though of far less importance, to which exception is taken, is the custom of requiring the sponsors to answer in the name of the child. Here again the difficulty is more imaginary than real; the fancied confusion of responsibility, on which the objection is grounded, exists rather in the mind of the objector than in the ordinance itself. Nor can much weight be fairly attached to the repugnance which Mr. Davis and others manifest to some parts of the Marriage Service. Who will say that with the present low tone of morality, both in town and country, the solemn warnings against impurity are not needed? Granting that the language of the admonition is plainer and more outspoken than accords with modern usage, still that is no valid reason for altering it. The outward and superficial delicacy of speech, which is part of our modern civilisation, is no certain warrant for real inward purity. On fitting occasions it is most salutary to break through the reserves of social conventionality, in order to touch the hidden springs of thought and feeling. The solemn celebration of holy matrimony is, without question, such an occasion, justifying the seeming violation of social propriety, which would otherwise be inexpedient and wrong. Language which would be out of place and unbecoming among lighter and less reverend associations, falls with a chastened sound on the heart at such a moment, when the mysterious bond of union for life and for death is being sealed between man and wife in the presence of the Most High. But we need not dwell on this point. The too fastidious scruples, which used not long ago to lead to the mutilation of the Marriage Service, are very infrequent now. There is a more general feeling of the necessity for speaking plainly, if at all, in the way of exhortation; and the deepening sense of the awfulness of holy places and holy rites counteracts the morbid fear of apparent indelicacy, which we have been speaking of. These scruples, we repeat, are not now of wide prevalence; and, like many others of the kind, vanish before a little reflection.

We have another imaginary difficulty, though of a still more minute kind, in the objection to the words 'most religious' as applied to the reigning sovereign. Of course there is no real difficulty at all. They are applied, like the title 'Defender of the Faith,' to the office, not to the person. Good King George III., whom Mr. Davis quotes, showed his humility rather than his common sense in saying that instead of 'Most religious King,' it ought to be 'the most miserable sinner.' Some other of the many alterations proposed are too trivial to deserve much notice; for example, the substitution of 'Morning'

and 'Evening' Prayer, for 'Matins' and 'Evensong,' 'Festival' for 'Feast,' and 'day by day' for 'this day' in the Lord's Prayer. Certainly there is such a thing as a *cacoethes emendandi*.

But there is one point of real importance which ought not to be overlooked. A tendency may be discerned in some quarters, as in these pamphlets, to wish to alter what are called the 'obsolete phrases' in the Prayer-book, such as are found, for example, in the Marriage Service. But where is the necessity? From having been used continually and generally, such phrases can never really become obsolete. They present no difficulty even to the uneducated persons who fail to understand their exact meaning. Evidently, on merely literary considerations, it would be a great mistake to obliterate these racy and idiomatic relics of our old English tongue. But they are valuable for higher reasons also. They are venerable from their age, and familiar by long usage; they form a link between successive generations who have knelt in the same holy places, and joined in the same holy services. The loss in this respect would far outweigh the trifling advantage of making the service rather more universally intelligible. It would be a fatal error to abandon the time-honoured diction of the Prayer-book, by modernising and simplifying it, for the sake of attaining what is really unattainable and most undesirable,—a form of Prayer lowered to the level of every one's comprehension.

But it is in the attempt to shorten and rearrange the services that popular reformers of the Prayer-book betray their incompetency most egregiously. Not very long ago a clergyman, of great repute as a preacher, the incumbent of a large town parish, put forth a scheme for rearranging the Sunday services, a prominent feature of which was a celebration of the Holy Communion *in the evening*, in disregard of the prescriptive custom of the Catholic Church, and in apparent ignorance of the important considerations on which that custom is grounded! We mention this as one instance among many others. Both the writers before us try their hands at this work, as if it were the easiest thing in the world. We must defer this subject for the present, till we come to consider the Reports of Convocation, in which it occupies an important place. But we must observe, in passing, that we look in vain for any regulating principles of reconstruction in these pamphlets. We find no reference either to the great standard treatises of our old divines on the Prayer-book, or to the no less valuable works of living authors, such as Jebb, Freeman, Palmer, &c. The one writer would curtail a few verses from most of the Canticles, as if the sense would remain unimpaired. The other would omit, strange to say, the *Second Lesson* from one of the Services. Both seem agreed,

if not in other details of their plans, to demur to the repetition of the Lord's Prayer, as if all repetitions were alike included under the censure pronounced against '*rain repetitions*;' as if there were no precedent in the garden of Gethsemane for repeating the same words of fervent prayer more than once, and as if that divine prayer did not occur with fresh significance and appropriateness, however often it may be used in the Service. It is wearying to hear this continual outcry against any prayer, but especially this prayer, being recited more than once in the same Service. The writers in question seem perfectly unaware that the various Services which of late years have been combined into one long Morning Service on Sunday, may be used separately, as seems to have been originally intended. Crude and ill-advised suggestions, such as those which have been mentioned, framed on no guiding principles, unauthorised by liturgical precedents, the result of hasty and inconclusive reasonings, cannot be too earnestly deprecated. It is really like a child pulling a watch to pieces, and vainly trying to readjust in proper order its exquisite and intricate mechanism. These two pamphlets are not in themselves in any way remarkable: but they are samples of the rash and mischievous innovation which threatens the Prayer-book at this time. If anything really must be done in the way of forming new Services, it must be done in a very different way.

It is a relief to turn from the incoherent and unpractical projects of these self-constituted reformers to the Reports of Convocation. There we find the same subject, the revision of the Prayer-book, brought forward more than once in the last few years. Both Houses have pronounced—the Upper with perfect unanimity, and the Lower with only one or two faintly dissentient voices—that the '*Prayer-book ought to be preserved entire and unaltered.*' But, on the further question of introducing supplementary Services, we find some difference of opinion. Certainly, if Convocation has done nothing else, it has afforded a good opportunity for the ventilation of important questions, not only by eliciting the opinions of the most eminent of the clergy in both Houses in the course of discussion, but also by the Reports resulting from the more silent labours of the Committees. Whatever may be the defects in its present constitution, it represents and gives utterance as nothing else does to the sentiments of the Church of England. It is worth while to trace its proceedings on this subject.

In 1854 a Joint Committee of both Houses reported in favour of dividing the Services, and of adding some new Occasional Services, '*to be formed from the Prayer-book.*' In February,

1855, a debate ensued in both Houses on this Report. After considerable discussion, certain resolutions proposed by the Bishop of Oxford were finally carried in the Upper House, to the effect that some modification in regard to the Services is desirable, but only so far as concerns the Rubric, the division of the Services, the Psalter, and the Table of Lessons. It was agreed that these resolutions should be embodied in any address that might be presented to the Crown. A very similar resolution was passed by the Lower House; with this difference, that they insisted on restricting the alteration of the Rubric, Psalter, and Lessons by the following limitation: 'only so far as may be necessary for the division of the old and formation of new Services.' Most of our readers, we think, will concur with the Lower House in wishing to narrow, as far as possible, the alterations required. Waiving for the present the question, which is no easy one, of the legal possibility of altering the Rubric without an Act of Parliament (a question which seems to affect any alteration of the Calendar as well as of the Rubric), there is an important distinction in another point of view to be drawn: any project for altering the Rubric would be the beginning of controversy.

But to return to Convocation. The subject was resumed after a considerable interval, in February, 1859. The Bishop of Oxford, with all the persuasiveness of his earnest eloquence and commanding intellect, urged the expediency of appending six or seven occasional services to the Prayer-book, and thought that this could be done by licence from the Crown, without any recourse to Parliament. But the Bishops were divided in opinion; some feared the danger of stirring the question of revision at all; others doubted this licensing power alleged to reside in the Queen's prerogative. The motion was lost, but only by the casting vote of the President. Meantime, a resolution of similar tendency had been agreed to in the Lower House. So the question waits for the present; in all probability to be revived and re-considered at the next meeting of Convocation.

In the cautiousness and deliberation of this movement, there is nothing to cause surprise or regret. Many and serious are the considerations involved. Granting, for the moment, that there is much to be desired—that shorter and more diversified services would be a great gain, especially in the present state of our population; allowing all due weight to the argument that a wise and moderate reform is the best preventive of resolution; still one great difficulty stops the way. How can such alterations be made, in the face of the Act of Uniformity, without permission of Parliament;—a Parliament no longer

consisting of even nominal Churchmen, but influenced in no slight degree by interests hostile to the Church, and singularly unqualified by temperament and constitution to act as a tribunal in such a matter as the revision of the Prayer-book? It arises, we conceive, from a sense of this danger,—a danger which indeed can hardly be overrated, that we find some of those who usually sympathise with Bishop Wilberforce, hesitating to commit themselves to unreserved agreement with his proposal.

But we must be clear on this point. We are not disputing for one moment that Parliament has a voice in the matter. The two Houses of Parliament, together with the Crown, represent the nation, and as such are one of the two parties to the compact between Church and State. This compact rests on the principle that the formularies once approved and ratified cannot be altered without consent of both parties. The State has clearly the right of withholding the legal sanction of its authority to any alteration which it disapproves. Otherwise the State might find itself continuing to support and uphold a religion changed in doctrine and practice from the first intention. It may refuse its assent; and if the alteration be persisted in, it may even withdraw the temporal privileges which it has conferred. There is no grievance or injustice so far. All this is plainly involved in the very idea of an established Church. But this is all. The State may accept or reject alterations proposed by the Church; and might even proceed, in case of the Prayer-book being altered without its consent, though this would be an extreme measure, to refuse to observe any longer a contract, which, it might contend, had been broken; but it has no right to enact any alterations of its own motion; no right even to take this or that part of the scheme proposed by the Church, so devising in fact a scheme of its own. It must accept or reject *in toto*. Now the danger is, that this important distinction would at the present time be disregarded. It is extremely unlikely that Parliament would consent to pass an enabling Act to authorize the Church to make new Formularies; that such a permission would be granted, implying, as it would, an assent by anticipation, seems out of the question. Nor in all probability would Parliament be content simply to say 'yes' or 'no' to any plan of alteration laid before it. Probably the plan would be discussed in detail;—the most inconsiderate suggestions would be proffered, and perhaps adopted;—and questions which ought to be calmly and deliberately considered by a conclave of Churchmen only, would be rudely handled by a miscellaneous assembly composed not entirely even of nominal Christians.

Clearly the Prayer-book cannot be altered without a new Act of Uniformity, to repeal the force of the 36th Canon as

it now stands. Equally certain is it, that there are reasons which make an appeal to Parliament for this purpose a most dangerous step at this time. When the Church of England becomes, as we may reasonably hope it will in time, more united in itself, more adequately represented by synods, gathered not from one province nor consisting only of ecclesiastics; when the various questions of the connexion between Church and State shall be no longer, as they are now, in process of solution, but decided one way or the other, then the Church will be in a position to make whatever alterations may be really necessary; and to claim for them, with more authority than at present, the ratification of the State; or, if the course of events should be overruled by Providence, as seems not unlikely, to the gradual separation of Church and State, to proceed without the intervention of Parliament at all. Looking to either contingency, it seems the wisest course to wait.

But something can be done, it is said, and with apparent reason, without Parliament. The Bishop of Oxford, though guarding himself from being supposed to speak positively, referred to legal authorities as supporting his view of the practicability of legalising new services without the help of Parliament. The same argument has been urged by Mr. Massingberd, a very competent authority, in an interesting letter which appears in the '*Journal of Convocation*,' vol. i. He there cites several precedents from the reign of Elizabeth downwards, tending to show that the Crown has continually possessed and exercised this 'dispensing power' of authorising special services, drawn up by the Church, to be used without any violation of the Act of Uniformity. The special services of Thanksgiving and Humiliation, which emanate so frequently from the same source, and are generally received without question, as well as the custom of Parliament attending services ordered only by the Crown, go to prove the same thing. The scope of these precedents can hardly be extended so as to cover any infringement on the Prayer-book as it stands, even in its calendar of Lessons, but they appear to warrant the addition of new services to be used as occasion requires.

But, supposing this mode of proceeding to be practicable, what are the particular points to which a Royal Commission of Bishops and other divines ought to direct their attention? Several new services have been suggested. A service of Thanksgiving for any especial public blessings, not for harvest-time only, but such as might be suitable on other similar occasions, is perhaps one of the chief desiderata. For, ever since the Reformation, a less jubilant and more penitential tone has pervaded our services. A Form of Humiliation and

Deprecation, in times of pestilence, or of any other public calamity, is less urgently needed; we have one already in the Litany, and for extraordinary occasions in the Communion Service.¹ Another service, the want of which is often felt, is one for the restoration to the Communion of the Church of those who have fallen away from it. A form of prayer for a blessing on the Missions of the Church has been spoken of, but this want is not a very pressing one. Still less has any case been made out for a Children's Service, an innovation of a most objectionable kind. The adoption of any such service, in the preposterous though popular idea of making all things plain to their understanding, would be virtually an estrangement of the younger members of the Church from their share in common prayer. Mr. Jebb, in a thoughtful and interesting letter, in the 'Journal of Convocation,' vol. i., has demonstrated most convincingly the absurdity of such a scheme; 'public prayer for classes,' for the young, for example, as distinct from the old, being, as he remarks, 'a feature not to be found in any Liturgy.' Perhaps an exception to this ought to be made in the case of Prison Services. A congregation of criminals seems really to require a special form of prayer, not one intended for persons in full enjoyment of their spiritual privileges. A short, simple, fervent service for the sake of the neglected and almost heathenish masses to be found in our great towns, to be used in church after an open-air service in the vicinity, would perhaps be a gain; but the Litany would suffice almost as well as any new service, for the purpose. Anything like a form of prayer to be used in schoolrooms or any other unconsecrated building, ought not to be thought of. We are too apt in these days to forget, that the House of God is the especial place where his presence dwells, and where, most of all, He may be sought and found. A form of Prayer for Consecration of Churches and Churchyards is wanted. The opportunity might be taken while framing and authorising these new services, to revise and improve the service for the Accession Day, and to give the formal assent of Convocation to it. These appear to be the new services that are required. We presume that they would be ordered to be used at the discretion of each Bishop in his own diocese. In cases of national rejoicing or humiliation, there would be a *consensus* of the Episcopal Bench generally.²

¹ The notion of having a fixed day every year set apart for national thanksgiving or humiliation, which some members of the Lower House seemed to entertain, is not very intelligible.

² Convocation, even with its present imperfect organisation, still as representing 'de facto' the Church of England, seems quite competent to address the Queen for

Anything more than such occasional services as these which we have mentioned, however much to be desired, seems hardly attainable by the exercise of the Crown's prerogative. But, to some extent, a remedy is near at hand, without even this extraneous assistance. The long service on Sunday morning is, or rather was, a grievance of this kind; we say a grievance, for the Sunday Morning Service is certainly too long for most persons to enjoy it as they ought: besides, the symmetry and significance of the several parts is marred by the combination. It is now an established fact that its component services may be used separately, wherever it may be desirable. Many town churches have already taken advantage of this permission, which comes now supported not only by the dictates of common sense, but by the express approval of the Bishops. Plainly there is nothing in the Prayer-book to forbid or discountenance this division of services. The more closely the history of the Prayer-book is investigated, the more incontestable it seems that the modern custom of combining the several services into one rests on no real authority. Mr. Massingberd, whose opinion carries weight, not only from his learning but from his well-known candour and fairness, has contributed some useful facts bearing on this point. In his letter, published in the '*Journal of Convocation*,' after citing Bishop Sparrow's opinion, he lays especial stress on the fact that the Bishops in the Savoy Conference spoke of the Services as distinct. Other proofs may be gathered from the immemorial custom of cathedrals and from history. But they are superfluous now. What we have to follow, in the interpretation of our formularies, is not the intention of those who framed them, but primarily the plain literal and grammatical meaning, in the form providentially delivered to us. We repeat, for it is a point of the utmost importance, that it is difficult, if not impossible, to prove from the Prayer-book that all and any of the ordinary services contained in it may not be used separately at any time by permission of the Bishop. The town congregations are likely more and more to wish to avail themselves of this elasticity. In country parishes, where people come from a distance, and by habit and temper are less impatient of a long service, but, on the contrary, rather like it, there is less need to separate the services. Sometimes the service is rendered tedious less by its own length than by an elaborate and pompous way of 'preaching the prayers.' This is a defect that may be cured without a Royal Commission. That our services may be used separately, wherever expedient,

a Royal Commission to frame such additions to the Prayer-book. The results of that Commission might be submitted, if necessary, to representatives of the Northern Province as well as to the Convocation of Canterbury.

is a fact now generally admitted, and one leading to most advantageous results.

A third Service for Sunday Evening has been proposed, but seems unnecessary with this division of services. The Litany, with catechising, is often used in the afternoon, and the Evening Service later in the day. Possibly, but we speak under correction, it is not against rule to read the First Lessons for the day in lieu of those for the Sunday afternoon, where the Afternoon Service is simply repeated in the evening. A discretionary power in the Diocesan to order Lessons would be of advantage, but is not compatible, we conceive, with the law at present.

There is scarcely anything more urgently wanted than a short form of daily prayer.¹ In this respect we might wish, if it were possible, to take a hint even from such a source as the Irvingite Prayer-book—a Prayer-book, we may remark in passing, not without great merits. It provides, unless we mistake, a longer and a shorter form for daily use. The omission of the introductory part, or of any other part of our Daily Service—a practice here and there ventured upon—is, of course, quite indefensible, and of most dangerous tendency. While the Daily Prayer remains as it is, we must use it in its integrity. Or why not sometimes substitute the Litany? If it be objected that many persons are deterred by the length of the service from attending it, we must try to meet the evil in another way. Surely it would be far better for persons of scanty leisure to come for *part* of the service on week-days than not at all. Until this practice becomes more familiar to the English nation, the churches will remain almost empty from Sunday to Sunday. Another habit that ought to be encouraged, is that of resorting at spare moments to church for private prayer. It is because we realize so faintly the great truth that a Divine Presence resides in the house of God, there accessible to all who approach it rightly, that we are apt to think more of the congregation than of Him whom they come to worship. Otherwise we should not so often hear the want of a congregation alleged as a reason for not having week-day services. Our Daily Prayer is, it must be owned, not adapted, in its present form, for general use. Still, as we have said, this ought not to deter those who are reasonably hindered from attending during the whole of it, from being present at least during a part, or, if not then, at some other time of the

¹ A short form for common days might be made, when the time shall come, by abridging the Lessons, omitting the Exhortation, and the three Collects after the Anthem. Of course the model of Ancient Services should be followed as far as possible.

day. It is much to be wished that the daily lives of Englishmen were sanctified by the hallowing custom, in these days strangely alien to our habits, of repairing to the house of God for a blessing on their work or their recreation. Even those very persons who feel most strongly the holiness of one day in every week, often most inconsistently appear unable to perceive the corresponding sanctity of particular places.

The second exhortation in the Communion Service, we mean that addressed to the communicants, has sometimes been objected to in Convocation. It has been said that this is calculated to raise disquieting scruples at a time when the hearers are fully prepared to draw near with faith and a quiet mind. We do not deny the force of this objection. But it is reasonably doubted whether that exhortation is not intended only for those occasions when notice of communion is given. It is equivalent to the Presbyterian 'fencing the tables,' and if this view is correct it ought not to be addressed to the communicants: that is, it is not part of the Liturgy, strictly so called.

But our limits forbid us to enlarge on this or other points of a similar kind. Only two difficulties, both of considerable importance, remain, which ought not to be unnoticed. The repugnance to some of the Apocryphal Lessons is not peculiar to the so-called Evangelical party. But we cannot see any legal way of substituting Lessons of a more edifying character than that of Bel and the Dragon. The only remedy seems to be to take opportunities of explaining the true position which the Apocrypha holds according to the Church of England. It is impossible not to wish that our Table of Lessons could be improved. Shorter and more select lections from Holy Scripture would be a great improvement. But it is one which we must be content to wait for, till a fitter time for alteration shall arrive.

The other difficulty is one still more generally felt, and though often overstated, still one that cannot be denied. Almost every day, in one parish or another, proves how ill adapted the Burial Service is for indiscriminate use. But it is not the Service that ought to be altered; it is the indiscriminate use of it. The 4,000 Clergy who remonstrated against this evil, have been misrepresented as asking for alteration in the service; but we feel confident that this, so far from being the general desire, would be deeply regretted. The restoration of primitive discipline is one remedy proposed; but this is a course more easy to speak of than to follow in the present relations of Church and State. Indeed it seems as if it were providentially ordered, that the Church in its maturity should gradually be deprived of the external restraints which were a support in the early growth of

Christianity. Anyhow, the present age is one which cannot be constrained by force in spiritual matters. The practical difficulty of enforcing ecclesiastical censures is insurmountable. What, then, can be done? The present service is evidently adapted, in its tone of joyful confidence, for those who die in full communion. A service less expressive of hope and joy is wanted for such persons as are not communicants. Clearly it cannot and ought not to be left to the Clergy individually to pronounce on the state of the deceased, whatever may be the appearances. But a broad line might be drawn between communicants and others. If such a service can be classed in the category of occasional services, it would be a great boon from a Royal Commission. Meantime it ought to be generally understood that the expressions of hope and thankfulness, properly belonging only to the faithful, are not withheld even from others, *simply because no clergyman has the right, by his own unassisted judgment, to assume that they ought not to be used in any particular case*; whatever misgivings he may be forced to feel as to their being inapplicable.¹

It is time to conclude these remarks, very inadequate as we feel them to be to the importance and extensiveness of the subject. No doubt, as we commenced by saying, the Prayer-book might be improved. But while admitting this, let us be heartily thankful for what we have already. We have a Prayer-book not only full of heavenly beauty, breathing the wise and holy spirit of ancient times, but dear and precious, in spite of all detractation, to the hearts of the people. Their instinctive affection for it needs to be developed into a more intelligent reverence. The pulpit, by clearly enunciated, but not drily didactic, exposition of the doctrines of the Church, must defend the Prayer-book. For such improvements as cannot safely be attempted now, let us wait hopefully. It would be a great improvement if we had more variety of colour, so to speak, instead of a sort of neutral tint, in our services for different seasons; a more special appropriateness, for example, in the Psalms and Lessons for days of joy or sorrow:—the Catechism also seems to want the insertion of some additional instruction on the nature and office of the ministry: but for these and other such improvements, weighing the preponderating risks attendant on the mode of proceeding, we shall be wise to wait. But till when? We answer, till the Church of England shall feel itself more prepared by matured convictions to undertake the critical task of

¹ A false analogy is sometimes drawn between these expressions of hope and the thanksgiving for regeneration in the Baptism Service. But the cases are by no means parallel. In the infant there can have been no barrier to the divine grace: in the other case there may have been an unholy life frustrating it.

revision ; till parties shall have become, as they are becoming, more fused into agreement on cardinal truths, more willing to disagree amicably on minor points ; till the laity shall be more sensible of their duties and privileges as members of the Church. The tide of progress is advancing steadily in this direction. What may be the ultimate result of the now unsettled relations between Church and State need be no cause for alarm. If there be life and strength and unity within the Church, we may feel easy about external appliances. Of course, we ought to preserve them as long as we can ; but about the issue we need not fear. There are many encouraging signs. Ruri-decanal meetings of clergy and laity, now becoming common, are a great step towards lay-coöperation, and synodical action on a larger scale. The theological colleges are training the clergy in a deeper and more accurate knowledge of theology. The numerous schools for the Middle Classes, now rising everywhere, of the same kind as the great school at Hurstpierpoint, and, among other things, the invaluable practice of public catechising, are indoctrinating the laity. Everything indicates that a clearer and stronger conviction of the objective truths of religion is extending itself gradually through the Church, even in the face of many hindrances. We may reasonably hope, that in the course of some years the Church will be in a position to enter synodically on the consideration of those further improvements, which seem beyond the scope of the only legislative process at present safely open to us. Let us be content for a time to guard the Prayer-book, as it is, making only such additions to it as seem urgently needed, and are attainable without controversy in the Church, or an appeal to Parliament.

NOTICES.

WE have before us the Prospectus and Publications of the 'MARRIAGE LAW DEFENCE ASSOCIATION,' a Society which was formed some nine months ago to counteract the agitation for legalizing Marriage with a Deceased Wife's Sister, and we know not what monstrous alliances besides. The efforts of Messrs. Crowder and Maynard for their rich clients (who first violated the law and then determined, if they could, to alter it) have at length summoned into existence this Society, which bids fair to make their commission continue for some years. They have done good, after all, those pertinacious solicitors; for they have brought together, under a sense of common danger, men of all parties in the Church, whom we would fain see more frequently acting in concert. Among the Committee are found the names of the Duke of Marlborough, Lord Shaftesbury, Lord Campbell, and Lord John Manners; the Bishops of Lincoln, Oxford, and S. David's; the Vice-Chancellor, Sir W. Page Wood; the Archdeacons Hone, Sinclair, Hall, and Bickersteth; the Regius and Margaret Professors of Divinity at Oxford; Mr. Hugh Stowell, Mr. Auriol, Mr. Garbett, Mr. Claughton, Mr. W. R. Freemantle, Mr. Thorold, Mr. Roundell Palmer, Mr. Colquhoun, Mr. B. Hope, and a multitude of others. The Dean of Westminster is the Chairman.

Eight publications have been already issued, and more are to follow. No. 1 is the useful Speech of the Archbishop of Canterbury in the House of Lords, which has been reprinted by his Grace's express permission. No. 2 is a Speech by Lord Campbell, who, we were rejoiced to see, declared from the woolsack last session that his aversion to any change in the Law of Marriage remained unabated. No. 3 is a simple and lucid statement of the reasons, apart from those which may fairly be urged from Scripture, for retaining the Law as it is. No. 4 is a reprint of Dr. Hessey's 'Scripture Argument,' which appeared some years since. No. 5 is peculiarly useful, as showing how thoroughly the matter is a 'woman's question.' No. 6 is a selection of articles from public journals, and deals chiefly with the social aspect of the movement. No. 7 contains concise replies to Messrs. Crowder and Maynard's 'twenty-three (alleged) facts,' and converts them into mere fictions. And No. 8, which has just appeared, has for its title, 'Remarks on Dr. McCaul's Plea from Lev. xviii. 18, for marrying a Deceased Wife's Sister.' We commend it to the attention of Churchmen, and especially to that of the Clergy whom Dr. McCaul misrepresents in Convocation as Proctor for the Diocese of London. If there is anything in the criticism of the pamphlet, circulated by the Marriage Law Defence Association, Dr. McCaul's pamphlet—

First, mistakes the point really in question;

Secondly, labours to prove a point beside the question, but fails to prove even that; and,

Thirdly, by abandoning the true method of Scripture interpretation, lays Dr. McCaul open to the imputation of permitting a man to *marry, not merely his deceased wife's sister, but his own or his wife's niece, or even his own daughter.* In fact, to be consistent, Dr. McCaul is bound, in Lord John Russell's words, to 'consider the change of the law utterly imperfect, 'unless it is further altered to make it equally applicable to both sexes, 'and to all the degrees of relationship which have been mentioned.' At the last election for a Proctor for the London Clergy, Dr. McCaul, though declining to pledge himself against the proposed change in the law, if we remember rightly, stated that his own feelings were against the permission of these marriages on the third ground. If Dr. McCaul is again a candidate it will be on a distinct issue. Meanwhile he is in this difficulty :—Does he, now that he believes the permission to be scriptural, retain or recant his social view? If the former, he makes what God permits productive of great social evil. If the latter, it would be well for him to tell his brethren how he has settled his moral difficulty.

Unscriptural, opposed to antiquity, to the laws of England, to the spirit of the Reformation, and to all our domestic feelings, as the agitation against the Marriage Law undoubtedly is, its promoters are wealthy and obstinate, and, we hear, are determined again to apply to Parliament. The following forms of petition against their design have been prepared, and we believe are in many places in course of signature. They may be obtained at the office of the Association, No. 41, Parliament Street. We trust that Churchmen will exert themselves, as they certainly did not last session, not merely by petitioning, but by sending pecuniary aid to the Association.

Form of Petition against Alteration in the Marriage Law.

To the RIGHT HONOURABLE the LORDS SPIRITUAL and TEMPORAL of the UNITED KINGDOM of GREAT BRITAIN AND IRELAND in Parliament assembled :

or,

To the HONOURABLE the COMMONS of the UNITED KINGDOM of GREAT BRITAIN AND IRELAND in Parliament assembled :

The Humble Petition of the Undersigned, being Inhabitants [or other description] of

Sheweth,

That your Petitioners view with alarm the attempts which have been so perseveringly made to bring about a change in the Law of Marriage.

Your Petitioners therefore humbly pray your right honourable [or for the Commons 'your honourable'] House not to pass any Bill that has for its object the legalising of marriage within the degrees now prohibited by Law.

N.B. All Petitions must be in manuscript, without erasure or interlineation, and one Signature at least must appear on the same sheet as that on which the Petition itself is written. Every Petitioner must sign his or her own name or mark. It will save much trouble if Signatures for the Petitions to both Houses are obtained at the same time.

The Petitions to the House of Commons may be posted to the Petitioners' own Representative, to some Member of Parliament belonging to the Association, or to some other Member known to oppose the Bill. Those to the House of Lords, to the Diocesan or to any other Peer.

All Petitions sent by post to a Member of either House with the ends open, with the words 'Petition to Parliament' written on the cover, pass postage free, but not otherwise.

As Lord Bury's Bill will probably be brought again before the new Parliament this year at a very early date of the Session, those who desire to oppose it are earnestly advised to petition Parliament without delay.

We are somewhat late in noticing a small volume, entitled 'Athanasius and other Poems.' By a Fellow of a College. (London: Masters.) Those who are fond of truly religious poetry will find in it a union of sound dogmatic teaching with much that is eminently adapted to foster their spiritual life. The versification is smooth and flowing. Amidst much that pleases us, we should select 'Christmas Eve' as our special favourite. The poem which gives the name to the book embodies a large amount of historic lore, which is given with great spirit; but the metre reminds us so strongly of Lord Macaulay's ballad on the Battle of Naseby, that, despite ourselves, an unpleasant association will arise. Report ascribes this little volume to one whom many Scottish Churchmen know to have a deep claim upon their attention, arising from generous and faithful service which has been but ill repaid. It is some satisfaction to know that the person alluded to was offered, as we understand, a home in another institution connected with the Church in Scotland, and only declined it on the ground of a prior claim of duty in England.

'Readings on the History of Joseph and his Brethren' (London: Masters), is the name of a small volume of sermons preached in a country parish. They are well suited to their purpose, and would prove useful for lending libraries. A leading characteristic is the constant reference to the typical character of the events in the patriarch's life. We are very glad to observe this feature. Not only has the application of types a wonderful hold on the human heart,—a hold retained amidst the great possible varieties of age, country, and condition,—but in these days of rationalism it forms a very powerful indirect argument for the unity and supremacy of Holy Scripture—its unity, as connecting the Old Dispensation with Christ; its supremacy, as assigning to Scripture a mark which stamps it as peculiar, and as having its supremacy, as being that Book

Unde nil majus generatur ipso,
Nec viget quidquam simile aut secundum.

Mr. Freeman, the Vicar of Thorverton, Devon, has given to the Church at large four admirable 'Advent Sermons' (London: Masters), preached in the diocese which he now adorns. They are replete with sound and exact theology, brought to bear very closely and searchingly upon the lives of all of us. At the moment when this notice appears, the holy season, to which these discourses specially apply, will have past by; but there is

much which our clerical readers would find useful to their flocks at all times. The third Sermon is in many respects quite as applicable to Lent as Advent.

Christmas brings its characteristic publications. Christmas books have superseded Christmas boxes; and this practical age, as we delight in calling it, becomes especially practical in its *souvenirs*. The thing to be done in a Christmas book is to combine the elements of the useful and the beautiful; good illustrations are not to disguise a bad book, nor is the very best of books a real Christmas book without the smartest of covers and the best of woodcuts. Of late years the trashy flashy annuals, the Keepsakes and Friendship's Offerings of twenty years ago, consisting of fancy portraits of impossible young women, illustrating stories just a trifle more impossible, have been superseded by practical books, as they call them. And, strangely enough, the wheel of time seems to have exhausted the variety of 'illustrated gift-books;' for the volume which was among the first, as it certainly was the best, of the innovators, has reappeared in a second edition some fourteen years after its first publication. We allude to 'Poems and Pictures,' originally published by Burns, and now reproduced by Sampson Low. Mr. Dyce is among the artists employed, and there is a freshness and vigour in his drawings, and in some of those by Cope and Creswick, which certainly has not been exceeded in more recent times, when illustrative woodcuts have become as much a matter of manufacture as of art.—A Christmas book likely to obtain, as it certainly deserves, high popularity, is Mr. Routledge's 'James Montgomery's Poems.' It appears as a pendant to his well-known selections from Wordsworth and Longfellow, which have attained success in the last two years. Montgomery is a safe and level versifier, and his uniform good feeling and subdued taste is almost an excuse for the absence of the more divine qualities of the poet. Mr. Aris Willmott prefaces the collection with some observations which would be none the worse did he not use the word Catholic in a vulgar sense. The woodcuts, if deficient in originality, are executed with great mechanical skill, and as specimens of typographical excellence have never been exceeded.—In this respect they present a contrast to the beautiful edition of Tennyson's 'Princess' (Moxon), illustrated by Maclise in some admirable and most correct drawings, which, had they been as well cut and well printed as the Montgomery, would have left nothing to desire.—In Cats' 'Moral Emblems,' published by Mr. Longman, we have a production of a far more ambitious form. There is a valuable class of literature, little known and less valued among ourselves, consisting of emblematic and allegorical picture-proverbs, of which the only congeners among ourselves are the word-emblems of Quarles, and that class of poetry of which Herbert and Vaughan are the best known representatives. In Holland there was a great classical writer of this school, Jacob Cats, who had the luck to be associated with Adrian Van der Venne as his illustrator. This is the pair of emblematisers, the one pictorial, the other poetical, from whom the compilation issued in so sumptuous a form by Mr. Longman is derived. But Cats has a partner in this publication, one Robert Farlie, a Scotchman, whose forgotten work, 'Lychnocausia,' is added by Mr. Longman to Cats' 'Emblems.' As a literary curiosity

Farlie's work deserves attention. It rings every sort of change on the unpromising subject of lamps and candles; and every conceivable variety of the history of lights is invested with an odd and far-fetched moral meditation and commentary. The accompanying verses are always ingenious, sometimes very clever, and never other than suggestive: while the vignettes are at least a curious instance of ingenuity, in which the variety generally atones for the artistic mediocrity. Van der Venne's old engravings, stiff, solid, and grave, are very admirably rendered by Mr. Leighton: and we note the appearance of the book as likely to tell very favourably on art. There is a tendency to flimsiness and prettiness in most of our illustrations, which these grave, conscientious drawings will, if fairly studied, modify; and as illustrations of seventeenth century manners and costume, they possess an historical value. Every bit of property—to use the stage language—and every accessory contains something of allusion, and the satire is never ill-tempered. We must pass the highest eulogium on the mechanical and typographical execution of the book, and in dignity and artistic aim the volume is far ahead of its compeers. On the literary portion of the work, contributed by Mr. Richard Pigot, we cannot pass an unqualified eulogium. He has translated *Cats*, and with considerable skill: but the form of the book necessitated a blank page. *Cats'* emblem and Van der Venne's illustration occupy two pages: Farlie's little poem one: and the whole book is symmetrically divided into quatrains of pages. This arrangement necessitated a blank page, which Mr. Pigot has thought proper to fill with an omnium-gatherum of what he considers to be illustrative proverbs, adages, and choice bits of moral scraps from every conceivable authority. They show that Mr. Pigot has been a very multifarious reader; but they do not prove that he is an accurate transcriber, or a scholar: and, in our judgment, the necessity of filling a page was often the final cause of his selections. Theognis, Wilbye's Madrigals, the Four Gospels, and L. E. L. are hardly authorities that we like to see in juxtaposition, even for the most moral of sentiments. There is a great parade of literature which we think may, upon examination, be found delusive. For ourselves, we do not pretend to be judges of the appropriateness of certain Turkish proverbs cited by the editor; but we do know that the quotations in the following pages betray an ignorance of Latin:—pp. 7, 15, 19, 47, 50, 55, 83, 98, 167. But the author with whom Mr. Pigot is most unlucky is *Syrach*. With entire ignorance that this writer is the author of the Book of Ecclesiasticus, we have the following quotation:—

‘ — summisque negatum

Stare diu, nimioque graves sub pondere lapsus.’

Syrach. iii. 12,—

which, if from anything, is from some metrical paraphrase of the apocryphal writer which Mr. Pigot has fallen across, as he has met with an old French translation of *Ecclesiasticus*, which, utterly ignorant of its source, leads him into the following unlucky duet of quotations:—p. 147, ‘Ne monstre pas ta vaillance à bien boire,’ &c.—*Syrach*. xxxi. 29 [*i.e.* 25]; and then he quotes, ‘Wine measurably drank [*i.e.* drunk] and in season

[i.e. in reason] bringeth,' &c.—*Ecclesiasticus* xxi. 28, 30. Mr. Pigot will be very much surprised to know that his Latin poet, and the French moralist, and *Ecclesiasticus*, and *Syrach*, are all one and the same author. We must, however, add that Mr. Pigot's translations are lively; and that his drawbacks are confined to claims to a scholarship which his acquirements cannot support: and we regret that there is this abatement to a volume which in other respects does great credit to all concerned in its production.

One of the most pleasant books of the day is Dr. Wordsworth's new edition of Park's 'Life of Mr. Stevens, sometime Treasurer to Queen Anne's Bounty' (Rivingtons). Mr. Stevens continued and represented the old-fashioned and solid Churchmanship of that school of which the Nonjurors and Robert Nelson are the most distinguished examples. This book shows what an amount of real work was done by those who inherited the high principles of Horne, Jones of Nayland, and their contemporaries; and such men not only relieve a century from much of the stigma which has been cast upon it, but this instance of the Christian gentleman displays an amount of quiet personal sacrifice and a life full of zeal and charity, which in other ages would have received a more enduring recognition than this modest memoir. Dr. Wordsworth's notes, and his catalogue of the members of 'Nobody's Club' especially, are not the least recommendation of a book which deserves a permanent place in our religious biography.

Mr. Todd, formerly of Manchester, has preached and printed a good harvest-home sermon, under the title of 'The Feast' (Masters), in which he disposes effectively of some objections raised against it by a local 'Teetotal Association.'

'Aggesden Vicarage' (J. W. Parker) is by far the best of the many tales to which Miss Yonge's success has given rise. In subtle and delicate analysis of character, and in real life-painting, we are not sure that the present authoress—for the lady's hand is apparent in it—does not equal the writer of the 'Heir of Radclyffe.' Plot, incident, and scenery are scarcely attempted in 'Aggesden Vicarage.' The book is a sort of *tour de force*: the materials selected being of the scantiest and homeliest, the problem is to display and to apply moral principles as they ought to be found working in the simplest of households and in the trivial concerns of common life. The lesson is that nothing is too mean or small not to be done on right motives. That this conventional life may not occasionally tend to a morbid extreme, just as people who are always coddling are apt to catch cold, is undeniable: but the whole subject is a very deep and important one; and of the thoughtful way in which it is treated in this work there cannot be two opinions.

It is not to be wondered at, though the spirit is alien from that reverential aspect of God's dealings with mankind which views Him as working evermore in His Church, that the present political aspect of the Continent has given encouragement to the theological *ambubaiarum collegia*, phar-

macopole. The notorious Dr. Cumming has got himself puffed, or has got leave to puff himself, in the *Times*, to the no small loss of literary credit of the great newspaper. Among a host of imitators seldom worse than himself, we may mention the 'Revival Movement,' by Major Bolton (Houlston and Wright), who tells us that the Papacy is to be finally destroyed in December, 1859; that next year the Turks are to be driven out of Palestine by the Czar, but in 1868 the Russians are all to be destroyed upon the mountains of Israel, after which Babylon is to be destroyed; which Babylon, with a liberalness which argues an approach to common sense, but which has suggested the absurdity of this school of prophecy, we are told is 'the countries formerly constituting the Babylonian empire' (p. 40); after all this is to ensue a 'Millennial Revival.'

Mr. Heilbroun has done service in compiling, from Bishop Mant's Bampton Lectures, an antidote to the Irish fanaticism, 'A Short Tract for Revivalists' (Rivingtons), which would do good, were there the least hope that this matter can be dealt with by reason. We hope to take up the whole subject; and it will be best discussed when, as will be the case three months hence, much of the delusion will have passed away. If a decisive test were wanted of the general character of the movement, such could be found in the very mechanical and business-like way in which it is attempted, hitherto with very little success, to 'get up' revivals in England. A clear and brief argument on the whole subject is contained in an anonymous pamphlet, 'The Second Coming of Christ.' (Edinburgh: Lendrum. London: Masters.) When we use the phrase 'get up,' we are aware that it is an invidious one: but the following extract from a Liverpool newspaper will explain our meaning. The speaker is the Rev. Dr. McNeile; the occasion the Prize-Day at the Collegiate Institution, the Bishop of the Diocese presiding:—

'He hoped they would bear with him, when, for the edification of the children, he read a passage met with a day or two ago, from an address made by a Clergyman in the diocese of Hereford, to a large meeting at Newport, in Monmouthshire. He told what he saw in a school at the North of Ireland, during a visit there, in a town with which he (Dr. McNeile) was well acquainted. He said in the school the children were so serious, so quiet, looking up with so much intelligence when they were addressed, that he remarked to his companion, the Clergyman of the place, "What extraordinary children these are." "Yes," the answer was, "ever since the revival of religion they are quite different children." On a Saturday evening, as the Clergyman was passing a church, he saw a door open and he looked in. Inside there was an inner door, and while he was in the passage he heard from within the voice of boys in prayer. He paused and listened, and heard words like these:—"Oh, God, have mercy on these dear boys, who are so sorry for their sins. Oh, God, convert these boys, so unhappy; put down thy hand, oh God, and lift them up, and show them what Jesus has done for them." He opened the door, and there were six boys inside—three kneeling and three standing; the three who were standing were praying. He said, "My dear boys, what is the matter?" "Oh, sir," said one of them, "these three boys that are kneeling are so anxious about their souls, and we are

'praying for them.' He said, very seriously, "Have you found comfort yourselves, my dear boys?" "Yes, sir, we have been very anxious indeed about our own souls; but we have found peace through Jesus Christ." Those boys had been engaged in that way an hour and a half on a summer evening. The rev. gentleman (Dr. M'Neile) referred to a private book which he had seen, kept by a boy now at Harrow School, in which were entries, "Oh, Lord, help me in writing my Latin verses;" "Oh, Lord, help me to remember the tenses of the Greek verbs;" "Oh, Lord, help me to keep my temper;" "*Oh, Lord, help me to play at cricket*" (a laugh). No, no, dear boys, do not laugh; oh, this was one of the most perfect specimens of real prayer that ever came under his notice. The rev. doctor proceeded to hold these instances up as worthy examples, and concluded by warmly seconding the motion.'

Mr. Neale's 'Translation of the Liturgies of S. Mark, S. James, S. Clement, S. Chrysostom, and the Church of Malabar,' (Hayes), worthily completes the good work which that accomplished ritualist began in his late edition of the Greek originals of these primitive sources of pure eucharistical doctrine. It was a great thing to have given to the Church, in so complete and accessible a form, a critical text of these sacred monuments of the primitive faith, which were before quite unattainable, except at a serious expense, by the theological student. But it is almost a greater advantage to be able to point to the present scholarly translation, in which an ordinary layman will be able to find all that he needs to know of the venerable ritual with which the Sacrament of the Eucharist has been celebrated in the principal Churches of the East from apostolic times. To an honest and reflective mind the perusal of this little volume will be worth more than many a formal essay on eucharistical doctrine; and it has a special value as a help to devotion, which could not be shared by a merely scientific treatise. We hope to hear that the original text of these Liturgies has been made a subject for our theological or ordination examinations. Merely in a philological sense, the study of their language is very important, in its relation to the Hellenistic Greek of the New Testament. But we should be still more glad to hear that, as a consequence of, and in some sense a compensation for, the painful controversies about the doctrine of the Holy Eucharist which have well-nigh distracted the Scotch Church, many of our more educated communicants had begun to inquire for themselves, by the aid of the present translation, in what words and forms the founders of the Eastern Churches embodied their faith as to this sacrament. Of the Translations before us, some are altered from Mr. Neale's own 'Introduction to the History of the Holy Eastern Church;' that of S. Clement is corrected from Brett, and that of the Malabar Liturgy is entirely new. They are all very readable, and, so far as our examination has extended, very literal and exact. There are numerous explanatory notes, but we are glad to see that the Editor, except in one instance in the preface, has scrupulously abstained from anything of a polemical character. In addition to the text, there is a succinct introduction, which explains the families into which ritualists have divided the ancient Liturgies, points out the chief differences

between the Eastern and the Western groups ; gives an abstract of the component parts of a fully developed Liturgy ; explains the peculiar ritual arrangements of an Oriental Church ; and, finally, affords a key to the mystical meaning of the more remarkable Eastern ceremonies. In the Appendix there is a most curious collection of the Formulæ of Institution as they occur in every extant Liturgy, sixty-seven in number, including, of course, those of the Monophysite, Nestorian, and Syro-Jacobite bodies. We have only to complain of the inferiority of the type and paper employed, and the small size of the page. But these blemishes are due to the cheap form in which the work appears. Still, for a book of permanent value, and one which ought to have its place in every clergyman's library, the octavo form is in all respects preferable. It is our earnest hope that this most able and useful work may assume this greater dignity in a second edition.

Mr. Benjamin Webb, Vicar of Sheen, has contributed to a local attempt at a county history—'The Annals of the Diocese of Lichfield'—'A History of Sheen.' It is quite curious to see how much of interesting information on an unpromising subject, a rude yet picturesque village in the wild Peak country, a diligent and earnest searcher may discover. Had the Clergy been for the last two or three centuries aware of the value to history of their local memoranda, taken on the spot and authenticated by documents daily disappearing, our large county histories would have been unnecessary. It ought to be a point of parochial duty for every incumbent to acquire what facts he can about the topographical and monumental history of his parish. Mr. Webb has furnished a very favourable specimen of such a parochial monograph ; and if the humblest it is not the least useful of his many services to literature.

Of an extremely useful and important work, 'Wiltch's Geography and Statistics of the Church,' the first volume has appeared, translated by Mr. Leitch (Bosworth), formerly known as the translator of Ottfried Müller's *Mythology*. It is announced and advertised with a 'Preface by Mr. F. Denison Maurice,' &c. ; said Preface consists of two pages, of which the upshot is that Mr. Maurice knows nothing, or next to nothing, about the translation which he prefaces, but has no doubt that it is a good book. Had Mr. Leitch reduced his learned author into a tabular form, he had, in our judgment, produced a more useful book.

NOTICE.

[We are desirous to receive from Colonial Church authorities, and Colonial Booksellers, offers for establishing an Agency, on terms suitable to the Colonial Clergy, for the circulation of the CHRISTIAN REMEMBRANCER. Address to the Publishers, 6, Paternoster Row.]

THE
CHRISTIAN REMEMBRANCER.

APRIL, 1860.

ART. I.—1. *Bacon's Essays, with Annotations.* By RICHARD WHATELY, D.D. Archbishop of Dublin. (Fourth Edition, revised and enlarged.) London: John W. Parker and Son, 1858.

2. *Examen de la Philosophie de Bacon.* Ouvrage Posthume du Comte JOSEPH DE MAISTRE. Troisième Edition. Lyon. 1852.

THE fame which encircles the names of some of our greatest literary heroes of the sixteenth century, has probably shone with more lustre during the present age than at any time since their decease. In the reign of William III. a miserable scribbler could steal whole pages from Milton's *Areopagitica*, without any fear of detection. Under Queen Anne the very language of Shakespeare appears, as Dean Trench observes, to have been considered far more difficult and obsolete than it is now found to be among even tolerably educated people. At a somewhat later date, Franklin could appropriate without suspicion the parable of Abraham, with which Bishop Jeremy Taylor had concluded his 'Liberty of Prophesying,' and 'it is,' says Hallam, 'a strange proof of the ignorance as to our earlier literature, which then prevailed, that for many years it continued to be quoted with his [Franklin's] name.'

Nous avons changé tout cela. Bishop Taylor has since that time been edited by Heber, and again, more carefully, by Mr. Eden. Two lives of Milton, those by Mr. Masson and Mr. Keightley, are at this moment before the public. And as for thefts from the writings of either the prelate or the poet, we can imagine the hue and cry which would immediately be raised by the critics and correspondents of such publications as the *Athenæum*, the *Saturday Review*, and the like.

Still greater is, we need scarcely say, the amount of labour

¹ Introd. to Literature of Europe, vol. iii. chap. ii.

which has been expended both in England and Germany upon Shakespeare. But greatest of all is, perhaps, the interest which is displayed concerning the works of Bacon.

Within the present century, we have had the able disquisitions of Coleridge, in the *Friend*, upon the reconciliation of the Platonic and Baconian methods of investigation; we have seen the collected edition of all Bacon's works, by that idolater of his reputation Mr. Basil Montague, and the well-known critique, upon editor and author, by Lord Macaulay. At the present moment, a far more splendid and complete edition is being brought out, under the auspices of three *alumni* of the famous college in Cambridge where Bacon received his early education. Sir John Herschel's 'Discourse on Natural Philosophy' is avowedly based upon Baconian principles, and glorifies his memory; and the same may be said of Dr. Whewell's two works, the 'History' and the 'Philosophy of the Inductive Sciences.' Archbishop Whately's annotated edition of the *Essays* has enjoyed a very prosperous sale. If we cross the Channel we find a weighty volume on Bacon, from the pen of a very distinguished author, M. de Remusat; and a learned German, Kuno Fischer, has composed a useful monograph (translated into English by Mr. Oxenford), on the relation of Bacon to Descartes, Kant, and other celebrated philosophers. The French dictionaries of biography do ample justice to the great Englishman, and one of them ably defends his memory against the attacks of Count Joseph de Maistre; for De Maistre, though in his famous 'Soirées de St. Petersbourg' he had mingled his opposition to Bacon's system with some words of kindness and admiration, appears in later life to have taken a thorough dislike to his memory, and to have been willing to believe all possible evil concerning him.

In proceeding to set forth our own sentiments, we meet with a difficulty at the very outset. That difficulty consists in the necessity of judging, without any sufficient *data*, how far we may assume a knowledge of the subject on the part of the reader. Now as our present article is not meant to be a pretentious one, we shall venture to start upon the assumption of the non-existence of any very complete and definite knowledge in our readers of the questions connected with the work of Bacon. We shall address them, as we might address an audience of educated hearers, who had general, but rather vague, impressions upon the subject. Is such assumption a piece of impertinence? We trust not. Lord Macaulay somewhere speaks of Bacon's writings, as being comparatively unstudied by the many, and only influencing the mass of mankind through the indirect agency of the few; and a French critic,

M. Morin, observes, in a similar strain : ‘ *Bacon est un de ces grands hommes, dont on parle beaucoup plus qu’on ne les connaît.*’

The leading events and characteristics of Bacon’s life may, however, be so easily obtained from any biographical work, that we shall touch upon them but lightly, excepting in so far as they evidently affect his moral and intellectual development, or stand in connexion with his publications.

Francis Bacon was the youngest son of Sir Nicolas Bacon, Keeper of the Seals under Queen Elizabeth for more than twenty years. His mother was one of a remarkable family, being a daughter of Sir Anthony Cooke. She and her sisters were all highly educated, and all made what are called great matches. One of them, Mildred, became Lady Burleigh; so that she and her sister Anne were the respective wives of the Keeper of the Seals under James I. and of the Prime Minister under Elizabeth. Lady Bacon is said to have been a woman of piety as well as learning, though it is a curious circumstance that, amongst other translations, she executed one from the Italian sermons of Ochino, one of the originators of Socinianism. It is however quite possible that the drift of Ochino’s arguments may not have been perceptible to the eye of his translator.

Bacon was entered at Trinity in his thirteenth year, and appears to have left the University by the time he was sixteen; a period of life much earlier than that at which most students now commence their academical career.

We cannot profess to judge how far Bacon was justified in the contempt which he subsequently entertained for the course of study then pursued at Cambridge; but it certainly does seem quite possible that a more real acquaintance with the works of Aristotle and Plato, than Bacon ever attained to, would have rendered his philosophy no worse, and his treatment of his great predecessors more just.

Three years, 1577 to 1580 (the first year being inclusive), were then spent by Bacon at Paris. It is, we presume, in the course of this visit that De Maistre supposes him to have secretly imbibed that poison of unbelief, which no one except that too ingenious reasoner ever pretended to have detected in his writings. It may, indeed, be granted that it was during a very bad time that Bacon visited Paris. Henry III. was on the throne, and while that monarch was exhibiting to his subjects an alternation of religious processions and litanies with the most childish and profligate amusements, the Huguenots had likewise (as the Protestant Sismondi remarks) lost their first religious fervour, and become more worldly in their policy, more savage in their

reprisals. That Bacon may have heard plenty of free-thinking during his stay in Paris, we do not doubt; that he was really infected by it is still, in the judgment of most men, and certainly in ours, not proven.

But the state of affairs in Paris must, we fear, have been calculated to increase the tendency of Bacon towards looking at life as a game for personal advancement rather than a state of combat for principle. He may indeed already have conceived those grand and large schemes of doing good to his fellow-creatures, of which he never, through all his chequered life, lost sight; but his notions of political life would probably be little improved by the change from Paris to London. In neither city, probably, did he come across a very high-minded order of statesmen. The English set, of which his father formed one, is thus characterised, in a religious point of view, by their fervid admirer, Lord Macaulay:—

‘They were one and all Protestants. In religious matters, however, though there is no reason to doubt that they were sincere, they were by no means zealous. None of them chose to run the smallest personal risk during the reign of Mary; none of them favoured the unhappy attempt of Northumberland in favour of his daughter-in-law; none of them shared in the desperate councils of Wyatt. They contrived to have business on the Continent; or, if they stayed in England, they heard mass, and kept Lent with great decorum. When those dark and perilous years had gone by, and when the crown had descended to a new sovereign, they took the lead in the reformation of the Church. But they proceeded, not with the impetuosity of theologians, but with the calm determination of statesmen. They acted, not like men who considered the Romish worship as a system too offensive to God, and too destructive of souls, to be tolerated for an hour, but like men who regarded the points in dispute among Christians as in themselves unimportant, and who were not restrained by any scruple of conscience from professing, as they had before professed, the Catholic faith of Mary, the Protestant faith of Edward, or any of the numerous intermediate combinations which the caprice of Henry and the servile policy of Cranmer had formed out of the doctrines of both the hostile parties.’

We cannot but think that, in judging Bacon, some allowance ought to be made for the kind of atmosphere in which he spent his youth. We should hardly expect from such culture a very heroic life, or a very heroic philosophy.

Bacon's father died suddenly in February, 1580, leaving his son Francis still a young man, under twenty, and very ill-provided for. His cousins, the Cecils, did less than nothing for him; they positively kept him down, and he would have found it difficult, if not to live, at any rate to study, but for the friendly and delicate generosity of the Earl of Essex. The return which Bacon made for that generosity is the darkest and saddest blot in all his history.

From 1580 to 1597, when Essex gave him, in the kindest manner, an estate worth two thousand pounds (a large sum

temp. Elizabethæ), Bacon had worked hard as a barrister, and with very considerable success. He had also made his powers felt in the House of Commons, though his line was not a very decided one.

In 1597 appeared his well-known volume of *Essays*. Dean Trench has remarked, that it was Bacon who first employed the word *Essay* in this sense; a sense which, we need scarcely say, it has ever since retained. Its popularity was great, and has endured. In successive editions it was enlarged into its present bulk, which is, however, still extremely small in reference to the amount of matter which it contains. One ardent Baconian, Sir James Mackintosh, has somewhere (though we cannot lay our hand upon the passage) described the *Essays* as 'the essence of all merely human wisdom,' and as a mental aliment fit to be ruminated, digested, and 'converted into part of the substance of the mind.'

We have not space to enter into the story of the fall of Essex, and of Bacon's shameful part, both in the prosecution and in the blackening of his patron's memory. 'Perchance,' says the Stagyrite, 'he suffered, but it should not have been at thy hands.' Such must be the sentiment of posterity towards Bacon in this matter. His bitter and shameful ingratitude is a disgrace to human nature.

The wonderful abilities, and the general courtesy of Bacon, combined (we are sorry to say) with the most miserable pliancy, helped him, in the succeeding reign of James, to overcome the injury to his own career, which might have been expected from his conduct to his deceased patron. Amidst a course of rapid success at the bar, he found time to produce, and to publish, in 1605, his wonderful treatise on the *Advancement of Learning*.

Although this treatise was afterwards expanded into the '*De Augmentis*' (of which it only forms a part), yet it remains in the shorter form, a most profound, comprehensive, and suggestive treatise, which can never be studied without advantage. Nowhere, we suspect, has Bacon written more magnificently, as regards the style, which, though (after the fashion of the day) somewhat overladen with Latin quotations, is still replete with noble images, and with the most admirable specimens of a copious and dignified eloquence. Let us, in passing, select one or two illustrations of this assertion.

The following is from his too flattering dedication to the king. We do not excuse the flattery, but can anything be happier than Bacon's comment on the text which he quotes?—

'And as the Scripture saith of the wisest king, "that his heart was as the sands of the sea," which though it be one of the largest bodies, yet it

consisteth of the smallest and finest portions ; so hath God given your Majesty a composition of understanding admirable, being able to compass and comprehend the greatest matters, and nevertheless to touch and apprehend the least.'

The following again, though of necessity somewhat one-sided, as we must expect from a reformer, puts us excellently in possession of the sentiments of Bacon towards the writings of the schoolmen.

'This kind of degenerate learning did chiefly reign amongst the schoolmen, who having sharp and strong wits, and abundance of leisure, and small variety of reading, (but their wits being shut up in the cells of a few authors, chiefly Aristotle, their dictator, as their persons were shut up in the cells of monasteries and colleges,) and knowing little history, either of nature or time, did, out of no great quantity of matter, and infinite agitation of wits, spin out unto us those laborious webs of learning, which are extant in their books. For the wit and mind of man, if it work upon matter, which is the contemplation of the creatures of God, worketh according to the stuff, and is limited thereby ; but if it work upon itself, as the spider worketh his web, there it is endless, and brings forth indeed cobwebs of learning, admirable for the fineness of thread and work, but of no substance or profit.'¹

But still grander is the following, which, though in some degree anticipated in certain well-known sentences of S. Bernard,² has always struck us as one of the finest passages in the English language.

'But the greatest error of all the rest, is the mistaking or misplacing of the last or furthest end of knowledge. For men have entered into a desire of learning and knowledge, sometimes upon a natural curiosity, and inquisitive appetite ; sometimes to entertain their minds with variety and delight ; sometimes for ornament and reputation ; and sometimes to enable them to victory of wit and contradiction ; and most times for lucre and profession ; and seldom sincerely to give a true account of their gift of reason, to the benefit and use of men ; as if there were sought in knowledge a couch, whereupon to rest a searching and restless spirit ; or a terrace, for a wandering and variable mind to walk up and down, with a fair prospect ; or a tower of state, for a proud mind to raise itself upon ; or a fort or commanding ground, for strife and contention ; or a shop for profit or sale ; and not a rich storehouse, for the glory of the Creator, and the relief of man's estate.'

¹ We do not for our own part accept this view ; and it would be easy to prove from such witnesses as Coleridge, Bishop Hampden, Sir G. C. Lewis, and above all Sir William Hamilton, that Bacon's case is over-stated. But from Bacon's stand-point, as the Germans would call it, and with a view to physical science only, it is intelligible, and perhaps capable of palliation, if not of positive defence.

² Some of our readers may be glad to be reminded of the *dicta* of S. Bernard. They occur in *Sermo xxxvii. in Cantica*.

'Sunt namque qui scire volunt, eo fine tantum, ut sciant : et turpis curiositas est.

'Et sunt qui scire volunt, ut sciantur ipsi, et turpis vanitas est. . . .

'Et sunt item qui scire volunt, ut scientiam suam vendant, verbi causa, pro pecuniâ, pro honoribus : et turpis quæstus est.

'Sed sunt qui scire volunt, ut ædificent : et caritas est.

'Et item qui scire volunt, ut ædificentur : et prudentia est.'

The Benedictine editors (p. 1400) cite a somewhat similar passage from John of Salisbury.

We shall not again follow Bacon to those courts of law where he pleaded as an advocate, and afterwards sat as a judge. He might have conferred upon his country something like an anticipation of the *Code Napoléon*, that is to say, a digest of laws resembling that code in systematisation, though of course differing from it as the wide distinction of time and clime would have required. But his legal abilities were, as we all know, directed to at least one harsh prosecution, conducted in the harshest manner, while he was Attorney-General; and to the receipt of bribes when he sat upon the woolsack. He was impeached and found guilty; and though the punishment of imprisonment was remitted, and likewise the fine of forty thousand pounds, he was a fallen and ruined man, and died in 1626, being the fifth year after his disgrace. In his enforced leisure, he had written a life of King Henry VII. which, in the eyes of such judges as Hallam and Mr. Gladstone, proves that his capacity for historic composition was not unworthy of his lofty reputation as a philosopher. He had revised his other works, such as the *Novum Organon*, which had first appeared in January, 1621, and had caused them to be translated into Latin. But amidst his literary and scientific pursuits he never ceased to try to regain the royal favour, caring little how abject might be his prayers, nor how excessive his adulation. It may, however, be questioned, whether Lingard is quite justified in insinuating that Bacon's death was hastened by the failure of his schemes. It is notorious, that an experiment made with snow, upon a dead fowl, brought on a sudden chill, which was enough to prove fatal to many a man of sixty-eight, without the additional pressure of disappointed ambition.

And now turning from Lord Bacon's life we must venture, not without diffidence, to make a few general remarks upon his philosophy. Perhaps for our present purpose the most convenient course will be, *firstly*, to state the claim made on behalf of Bacon by his most fervent admirers, and then to consider the objections to that claim, or the derogations from it even if granted, which have been urged from an historical, a philosophical, and a theological point of view.

The claim, then, asserted by Lord Bacon's admirers is mainly this: that before his time physical science made but little progress, because it was cultivated in an essentially erroneous manner; that he was the man who was the first to point out the mistake of the current system, and to bring about a reform, which has produced, and is still producing, results of the most triumphant and beneficial character; inasmuch that the great achievements and comforts of our modern civilization, the

discoveries of Newton, and the railway, the steamship, the telegraph, and the like, may be said to be,—indirectly, indeed, but still substantially—due to him.

It were easy to quote passages from the disciples and eulogists of the Baconian philosophy, such as Sir John Herschel, in his ‘Discourse on Natural Philosophy,’ or Hallam, or Lord Macaulay, which virtually assert at least as much as this. But it may to many readers be more striking, or at least more novel, if we give the less known words of one who is evidently not fond of Bacon. ‘His mission,’ says Dr. Newman, ‘was the ‘increase of physical enjoyment and social comfort; and most ‘wonderfully, most awfully, has he fulfilled his conception and ‘his design. Almost day by day have we fresh and fresh shoots, ‘and buds, and blossoms which are to ripen into fruit, on that ‘magical tree of knowledge which he planted, and to which ‘none of us perhaps, except the very poor, but owes, if not his ‘present life, at least his daily food, his health and general well-being. He was the divinely provided minister of temporal ‘benefits to all of us so great, that, whatever I am forced to ‘think of him as a man, I have not the heart from mere gratitude to speak of him severely. . . . I cannot deny he has abundantly achieved what he proposed. This is simply a method, ‘whereby bodily discomfords and temporal wants are to be most ‘effectually removed from the greatest number; and already, ‘before it has shown any signs of exhaustion, the gifts of nature, ‘in their most artificial shapes and luxurious profusion and ‘diversity, from all quarters of the earth, are, it is undeniable, ‘brought even to our doors, and we rejoice in them.’¹

The reform accomplished, or claiming to be accomplished, by Bacon was of a twofold character, *firstly*, as regards the object of his philosophy; and, *secondly*, as respects the instrument employed. Of its object we have spoken already. Dr. Newman’s description is in this respect true enough, and it might be confirmed, if necessary, by the citations which have carefully and effectively been brought together by Lord Macaulay. In Bacon’s own words, it was his object to aim at the relief of man’s estate: ‘Commodis humanis inservire—genus humanum novis operibus ‘et potestatibus continuo dotare.’

But at this point we are tempted to pause for a few moments and turn from the philosopher to his distinguished critic. Lord Macaulay’s article, in the ‘Edinburgh Review’ for July, 1837, is one of the most complete and brilliant of his performances; and, we must add, one of the unexceptionable in point of its general tone. In what we have thus far written, we are much

¹ Discourses on University Education. Discourse vi. pp. 192, 194.

indebted to it. As we proceed, we shall have to combat it in some of its details. But it may be well at this point to call attention to a very important misconception which, if we mistake not, underlies the whole of this writer's comparison between the Platonic and the Baconian philosophy. 'Two words,' says the accomplished Essayist, 'form the key of the 'Baconian doctrine, Utility and Progress. The ancient philosophy disdained to be useful, and was content to be stationary; it dealt largely in theories of moral perfection which were so sublime that they never could be more than theories; in attempts to solve insoluble enigmas; in exhortations to the attainment of unattainable frames of mind.' Now, even Hallam complains of the low sense in which, throughout this article, his friend has employed the word 'Utility.' Happily a corrective on this head has been supplied by the labours of another Edinburgh Reviewer. No protests against such restriction of the term to merely material and obvious advantages can be more emphatic than those of the late Sir William Hamilton.

What, however, seems to us one of the greatest and most weighty points of difference between ancient inquirers into morals and metaphysics, such as Plato, and modern investigators of physical laws, such as Bacon, is this: The ancient philosophers were, in a very great degree, the spiritual instructors, the theologians of their age. In modern times, a philosopher, who is a Christian, may fairly enough say to those who seek at his hand instruction in morals: 'I have no vocation in this direction; for moral teaching I refer you to the Scriptures and the Church, and to the authorised means of instruction, her Catechism, her services, her commissioned servants.' But Socrates could make no such reply, and surely under such circumstances he was almost justified in forming that comparatively low estimate of physical science which Xenophon has placed on record. Now this distinction is utterly ignored throughout the essay to which we refer.

'But their theories,' says the essayist, 'could never be more than mere theories.' Was it so indeed? was it a merely theoretical love of truth that induced the Athenian sage to drink the hemlock with cheerfulness? Did his teaching seem to be of this character to his pupil Xenophon, or to his Roman admirer, Cicero? Not to Xenophon, who represents him, as Mr. Grote justly observes, 'chiefly as a religious man, and a practical philanthropic preceptor.' Not to Cicero, who expressly writes concerning him: '*Primus philosophiam devocavit e cælo, et in*

¹ Some very similar query on the same subject has already been put by Mr. De Quincey.

*'urbibus collocavit, et in domos etiam introduxit, et coegit de vitâ et moribus rebusque bonis et malis quærere.'*¹

But there were not, it may urged, many like Socrates. True: but is it really possible to estimate precisely what would have been the condition of humanity, without the aid of that remarkable teaching? Inventors can unquestionably exhibit a definite and almost tangible success in their respective walks, which is denied to artists and mental teachers. Leonardo da Vinci is said to have invented locks on canals; Leonardo da Vinci painted that famous picture known throughout all Europe as the *Cenacolo*. We are far from wishing to underrate the great utility of that ingenious addition to the excellences of canals; but it is not perhaps wholly irrational to believe, that the divine countenance represented in the centre of that Last Supper, *may* have done as much good as the invention of locks. Even passing emotions that lift us above ourselves, are not wholly worthless; and how many, while gazing on this picture, or even on its copies, must have felt with Wordsworth—

‘The calm, ethereal grace,
The love deep-seated in the Saviour’s face,
The mercy, goodness, have not failed to awe
The elements; as they do melt and thaw
The heart of the beholder—and erase
(At least for one rapt moment) every trace
Of disobedience to the primal laws.’

To return to the Socratic philosophy, as taught by Plato. Did that teaching, though imbued with some sad errors of paganism, utterly clash with what came from a higher source? Some of the Jews, as Döllinger and others have observed, after the public translation of the Hebrew Scriptures into Greek at Alexandria, inclined to one or other of the Grecian schools of philosophy. ‘The Platonic,’ justly adds this most learned historian, ‘*must* have most recommended itself to the disciple of Moses.’² And while ‘fully granting that some danger and mischief, as well as benefit, did arise from this conjunction of Mosaic doctrine with Greek philosophy; it must be remembered that to that conjunction we owe such works as the Book of Wisdom and the Book of Ecclesiasticus. Some utility there surely must have been in a philosophy that was capable of such a union.

And when a loftier doctrine than that of Moses was, in the fulness of time, made known, was not there one school, of which the disciples were peculiarly willing to embrace that fuller reve-

¹ Tusc. Disp. v. 4, 10. Cf. Grote's Greece, Part II. chap. 68.

² Döllinger.—Heidenthum und Judenthum, p. 741.

lation? The readers of S. Augustine, more especially of his eighth book 'De Civitate Dei,' will not be at a loss for a reply. They will remember how constantly he speaks of the *Platonici* as *cæteris nobiliores—veritati propinquiore*. Is there or is there not any usefulness in a system which could thus prepare men for the truth? We must not, moreover, in alluding to S. Augustine, forget that to him also a pagan treatise, the 'Hortensius' of Cicero, was of great service on his road from heathenism, through Manichæism, to Christianity.

But even of that lower school, which Lord Macaulay so constantly, and so disadvantageously, contrasts with the Baconian, namely the Stoic, is it right that men should suppose that it achieved no useful task? A statesman may be expected to allow some value to the voice of law, more especially a system so grand, so comprehensive, so influential and interpenetrative of the framework of modern society, as the imperial Law of Rome. But that system, though the glory of its consummation belongs to the Emperor Justinian, owes its existence in great part to the labours of those stoic philosophers, without whose previous toils there would have been little or no material for the Emperor to build with.¹

But it is time for us to return to Bacon himself. We do so with the insertion of a single warning on the subject of utility from Sir William Hamilton's second Lecture on Metaphysics.

'Perfection (comprising happiness) being thus the one end of our existence in so far as man is considered, either as an end unto himself, or as a mean to the glory of his Creator; it is evident that absolutely speaking, that is without reference to special circumstances and relations, studies and sciences must, in common with all other pursuits, be judged useful as they constitute, and only as they contribute, to the perfection of our humanity—that is, to our perfection simply as men. It is manifest that in this relation alone can anything distinctively, emphatically, and without qualification, be denominated useful; for as our perfection as men is the paramount and universal end proposed to the species, whatever we may style useful in any other relation, ought, as conducive only to a subordinate and special end, to be so called, not simply, but with qualifying limitation. Prosperity has however, in this case, been reversed in common usage. For the term useful has been exclusively bestowed, in ordinary language, on those trenches of instruction, which, without reference to his general cultivation as a man or a gentleman, qualify an individual to earn his livelihood by a special knowledge or dexterity in some lucrative calling or profession; and it is easy to see how, after the word had been thus appropriated to what, following the Germans, we may call the *bread and butter* sciences, those which more proximately and exclusively contribute to the intellectual and moral dignity of man, should, as not having been styled the useful, come, in popular opinion, to be regarded as the useless branches of instruction.'

¹ See Gibbon, chap. xliv. and the remarks of Mr. Sandars, in the preface to his translation of Justinian's Institutes.

And now, having stated what is claimed on behalf of Bacon, let us proceed to the objections (whether total or partial) which have been urged in opposition to that claim. We have already classed them respectively as Historical, Philosophical, and Theological, and we now propose to consider them in order.

I. Those whom we should call the Historical objectors to the celebrity of Bacon, argue somewhat as follows:—‘We, as a body of critics, do not for the moment enter into the question whether induction, as an instrument of discovery in physical and other sciences, deserves to be rated so highly as thorough Baconians would have us believe. But what we maintain is, that this mode of study, whether over-rated or under-rated, did not begin with Bacon; and that he, therefore, has little or no claim to the glory thus shed around his memory. To say nothing of Aristotle in his *Natural History*, the state of science in Europe at the time of Bacon will not allow us to make such admission.’ The arch-opponent of Bacon’s fame, Count Joseph de Maistre, has insisted on this point among others with his usual liveliness in the fifth conversation of his *Soirées de Saint Petersburg*.

‘THE SENATOR.

‘He is like a man stamping beside a cradle, complaining that the child contained within it is not yet professor of mathematics or general of an army.

‘THE COUNT.

‘That is really extremely well put, and I do not even know whether it would not be possible to dispute the correctness of your comparison; for the sciences, at the commencement of the seventeenth century, were by no means a *child in a cradle*. Without mentioning the illustrious monk of his name, who had preceded him in England by three centuries, and whose acquirements would earn for men of our own age the title of *savans*, Bacon was the contemporary of Kepler, Galileo, Descartes; and Copernicus had preceded him. These four giants alone, without speaking of a hundred other less celebrated personages, were sufficient to take from him the right of speaking so contemptuously of the state of the sciences, which already, in his time, shed a brilliant light, and which in fact were all they could then be. The sciences do not progress as Bacon imagined; they spring up like all that springs up; they grow as all else grows; they are bound to the moral condition of man. Though free and active, and consequently capable of applying himself to the sciences, and of perfecting them, as to everything else that has been placed within his reach, he is perhaps more left to himself on this point than on any other; but it was Bacon’s whim to depreciate the learning of his age, without having ever been able to acquire it; and nothing is more curious in the history of the human mind than the imperturbable obstinacy with which this celebrated man persisted in denying the existence of the light which sparkled around him, because his own eyes were not so formed as to be capable of receiving it; for never was there a man more ignorant of the natural sciences, and of the laws of the universe.’

It must be owned, that there is force in these considerations. Even Hallam thinks that ‘a more positive efficacy has some-

'times been attributed to Bacon's philosophical writings than they really possessed,' and that 'it might be asked whether Italy, where he was probably not much known, were not the true school of experimental philosophy in Europe.'

We shall hardly be accused by those who have patience to read through this article, of being indiscriminating eulogists of Bacon, either as a man or a philosopher. But on this head the tendency of the day seems to us to run somewhat unduly counter to his claims. Granted be it, that individual discoveries, especially in Italy, had, without his aid, struck into somewhat similar paths in particular branches of science. But it still, we think, remains true, that what they had achieved here and there was by Bacon (who had no more help from *them* than they from *him*) first shown to be true, in so far as it is true, with respect to the whole cycle of natural sciences. As Dugald Stewart² justly puts it, he concentrated many feeble and scattered lights; and no books of his age can be placed on the same level with his in respect either of the largeness of the survey therein taken, or the dignified eloquence of the style. To the charge of the historical objectors we must, though not dismissing it as positively frivolous and vexatious, yet return the verdict of *not proven*.

II. The objections from the philosophic point of view are far more numerous and complicate. They may, perhaps, be fairly classed as follows :—

1. That induction is a useless process, being only another form of deduction; and that, consequently, the much-vaunted Baconian system of inquiry is a delusion and a failure.

2. That without stigmatizing induction as a wholly futile procedure, it must be maintained that no really great discovery has been made by it, as the sole and sufficient instrument of investigation. Consequently, that Bacon is in error in assigning to it so lofty a place.

3. That the modern methods of carrying out inductive inquiries differ considerably from those of Bacon; and that this again detracts from his supposed greatness.

4. That, even if induction deserve the estimate assigned to it by this philosopher in respect of physical science, it still remains true that there is a vast field of knowledge to which such modes of procedure are less applicable, and that any nation

¹ Literature of Europe, vol. iii. chap. 3. De Maistre would have pricked his ears at this admission of the greatness of Italy in experimental science. But, in truth, that greatness is beyond dispute. The names of Volta and Galvani, with her great geologists, and numberless other *physicists*, attest it in more recent times.

² Cit. ap. Hallam, *ubi supra*.

which should trust to an inductive philosophy alone, would almost inevitably become low in tone, grovelling, and (in the worst sense of the word) utilitarian.

To the justice of the first of these positions we demur, and we dissent from the inference sought to be drawn from the third; in the second and in the fourth, we are disposed to recognise a very considerable amount of truth. Let us try to examine them *seriatim*.

1. To represent induction as merely a form of deduction is one of those errors which might, perhaps, be excusable in De Maistre and others, but which can hardly, we think, stand its ground after the clear and expressive disquisition of Sir W. Hamilton. We hope that logical students will forgive us for reprinting what must be so well known to them. But it is so intimately bound up with our subject that we now take the liberty of again inflicting it on them.

Inductive.

x, y, z, are A;
x, y, z, are (whole) B;
Therefore B is A.

Deductive.

B is A;
x, y, z, are (under) B;
Therefore x, y, z, are A.¹

One of the leading features of difference in these two modes is the circumstance that, in the minor premiss of the deductive syllogism, the copula *are* means simply *are contained under*; whereas in the inductive syllogism it signifies *make up or constitute*.¹

There does, however, remain another very curious and important distinction, which is not apparent from the mere exhibition of contrast in form. It is this: *that the inductive syllogism is then, and then only, practically useful, when the minor premiss falls short of being a formal truth*. An illustration may perhaps make our meaning clear.

Mars, Venus, and Jupiter, are elliptical in their orbits;

Mars, Venus, and Jupiter, are [*i. e.* constitute] all planets;

Ergo, All planets are elliptical in their orbits.

Now the minor is in this instance not formally true; the three stars named do *not* constitute the entire body of planets, though they may so fairly represent their sister planets as to give us ground for drawing a general, and not a merely particular conclusion. But if, on the other hand, we extend our minor, and are able to include every single planet, it is then scarcely worth while to be at the trouble of asserting that to be true of all collectively which we have already affirmed of each in particular.

¹ We do not know that this important point was ever made perfectly clear before the appearance of the critique referred to. See Hamilton's 'Philosophical Dissertations,' p. 163.

Why, then, does the human mind thus rush to an inference respecting the whole of a class, when it has merely tested certain members of that class? We can only answer, because the human mind has been so constituted by its Creator. The most extreme anti-Baconian school would add something more. Its disciples would urge that the mind of man recognises the real and objective existence of classes; that it decides *à priori* what *are* and *are not* members of such and such a class; and that, consequently, as has been remarked, induction is a futile process. An equally extreme school of adversaries retorts that such realistic notions are false and obsolete, and that the force and value of an Induction depends merely and solely upon the number of instances adduced. We are unable to assent *in toto* to either of these opposing views; though of the two the latter has always seemed to us to be somewhat the further from the truth.

And firstly, as regards those who cry with the chorus in *Phrontisterion* :

‘Bacon, be dumb;
Newton, be mum;
The worth of induction’s a snap of the thumb.’

We venture to ask attention to the illustration afforded by Mr. Francis Newman, in those clever Lectures on Logic, which make us sorrowfully repeat, *O si sic omnia!*

‘On finding the Greek word *κοῖλος* to mean Hollow, probably no one is disposed to make a remark. But if it be pointed out that *Koil* and *Hole* are somewhat similar, he will reply that it is a chance similarity, and not very strong either; but no more than may be expected or fancied in numerous instances. Next show him *καρδία* and *Heart*, and he will make nearly the same answer. Then show him *Cornu* and *Horn*, and he will begin to think that there is something in it. Lastly, put the following table before him :—

κοῖλος—Hole. —Hollow. καρδία—Heart. κεφάλη { Germ. Kopf or Haupt. Caput—Head.	καλῆμος—Halm. κάνναβις { Canvas. Germ. Hauf. Hemp. κάρτος } Hard. κάρτυς } Germ. Hart. καρτερός }	Cornu—Horn. κύνες { Hunt. Hound. Canis { Germ. Hund. Cranium—Germ. Hirn.
--	---	--

And, if his mind have had any exercise in etymological inquiries, he will inevitably abandon all idea of the coincidences springing from chance. The separate instances are all possible, but the combination is impossible. The mind deduces here a general proposition that “The northern languages

often have the initial H, where the southern have initial K ;" which is verified in too many samples to be rejected: and the argument thus ultimately comes back to an Induction.'

We give this as an excellent example of the power possessed by number. On the other hand, it is important to observe, that this able writer has inserted a condition of no slight moment in the clause which we have italicised. The words 'if his mind have had any exercise in etymological inquiries,' imply the truth that a condition of a perfectly extra-logical character comes in before the induction can greatly influence the mind. A general principle *is* assumed, namely, the possibility of certain consonants being interchangeable. In the instance before us that principle may indeed have been attained by a prior induction. But there are many cases respecting which no similar assertion can be made, and hence the great difficulty of all attempts at explaining the precise grounds of such degree of cogency as induction does possess. For ourselves, we incline to the opinion, not that the mind wholly anticipates the conclusion to be attained (which would really make the process of Induction idle and unnecessary), but that it does perceive *à priori* some reasonable degree of possible connexion between the conclusion sought and the premises; and is thus prepared to admit the truth of the general law to which these instances point. More than this we cannot say at present, without entering deeply into the theory of Universals; a question at least as ancient as the time of Porphyry, and one respecting which a most accomplished living logician does not hesitate to assert, that 'modern philosophy feels the old difficulty to be still unsolved; to be lying at the basis of almost every important doubt, and to present the great check to its rapid and confident progress.'¹

We pass on, then, to the illustration of what seems to us the weak and untenable theory, that the force of Induction depends solely upon the number of instances. That this theory may not suffer from the mode in which it is presented, the reader shall be furnished with an example in which the Baconian rules are set forth with the lively apparatus of Lord Macaulay.

'We have heard that an eminent judge of the last generation was in the habit of jocosely propounding after dinner a theory, that the cause of the prevalence of Jacobinism was the practice of bearing three names. He quoted on the one side Charles James Fox, Richard Brinsley Sheridan John Horne Tooke, John Philpot Curran, Samuel Taylor Coleridge, Theobald Wolfe Tone. These were *instantiæ convenientes*. He then proceeded to cite instances *absentiæ in proximo*, William Pitt, William Windham, Samuel Horsley, Henry Dundas, Edmund Burke. He might have gone on

¹ Chretien, Essay on Logical Methods, p. 53. (Oxford: J. H. Parker. 1848.)

to instances *secundum magis et minus*. The practice of giving children three names has been for some time a growing practice, and Jacobinism has also been growing. The practice of giving children three names is more common in America than in England. In England we still have a King and a House of Lords; but the Americans are republicans. The *rejectiones* are obvious. Burke and Theobald Wolfe Tone are Irishmen; therefore the being an Irishman is not the cause of Jacobinism. Horsley and Horne Tooke are both clergymen: therefore the being a clergyman is not the cause of Jacobinism. Fox and Windham were both educated at Oxford; therefore the being educated at Oxford is not the cause of Jacobinism. Pitt and Horne Tooke were both educated at Cambridge; therefore the being educated at Cambridge is not the cause of Jacobinism. In this way our inductive philosopher arrives at what Bacon calls the Vintage, and pronounces that the having three names is the cause of Jacobinism.

'Here is an induction corresponding with Bacon's Analysis and ending in a monstrous absurdity. In what, then, does this induction differ from the induction which leads us to the conclusion that the presence of the sun is the cause of our having more light by day than by night? *The difference evidently is not in the kind of instances, but in the number of instances*; that is to say, the difference is not in that part of the process for which Bacon has given precise rules, but in a circumstance for which no precise rule can possibly be given. If the learned author of the theory about Jacobinism had enlarged either of his tables a little, his system would have been destroyed. The names of Tom Paine and William Wyndham Grenville would have been sufficient to do the work.'

We submit that this comment on the case will not hold. Whether the table of instances were enlarged or not, the practical result would be the same. If every man with three names were a Jacobin, if every man with two names were a Tory, it would still be impossible to persuade any sane reasoner that there was the smallest possible connexion between the circumstances. No; induction may be very far from futile, but it does not depend solely upon the number of instances.

2. That no great discovery has been made by induction, *pure et simple*, we hold to be an impregnable position. Few philosophers would now, we think, care to question the truth of the doctrine so ably maintained by Coleridge, in the third volume of *The Friend*, that in all great discoveries (perhaps even in all discoveries, excepting those alighted on by chance) there is an anticipation, a Greek would perhaps have termed it an *ἀρχή* or *εἰσροχία*, that in some degree foresees the conclusion which induction will ultimately prove.

But if, then, great discoveries are not made by the process of induction, by what process are they made? We answer fearlessly, but we hope not irreverently, by a *kind of inspiration from the Most High*. Just as it pleases God, in His good providence, to make some men channels of blessings to their fellow-creatures, by rendering them the *media* of the revelation of Himself and His will in things divine; even so too does He select others, as the instruments of making known to those

around them truths in things natural (physical or metaphysical), which had previously been unknown, or but imperfectly understood. We will refer to two exemplifications only; but the greatness of the names involved will be allowed to represent hosts. They are those of Newton and Kepler.¹ Of Newton, a former editor of Bacon writes: 'Where the business of investigation depended upon experiments, as particularly in his excellent inquiries about light, he seems first to have imagined in his mind how things were, and afterwards contrived his experiments, on purpose to show whether those things were as he had preconceived them or not.' As to Kepler, the greater as well as the earlier of the two, and the veritable founder of modern astronomy, it is well known that the study of theology exercised a great influence upon his writings, and it was probably by a kind of mystical intuition, quite as much as by anything like inductive experiment, that he arrived at the second and third of his three famous laws. These three laws are, as is well known: 1. That the planets move in the orbit of an ellipse, of which the sun is one of the *foci*. 2. That they describe equal areas in equal times. 3. That the squares of the times of revolution of any two planets are as the cubes of their distances. If any of these marvellous discoveries were due to induction alone, it would be the first. But it is curious, that though this law rightly stands first in order, it was not the first discovered by Kepler, but the second. The third law, we agree with De Maistre, is like a kind of divination.

We must content ourselves with reference to these two philosophers, but we feel well-nigh sure that further proof, if any is needed, may be found in the discoveries of Goethe, in anatomy and the organization of plants, and probably also from the keen, though friendly contests between Cuvier and Geoffroy de S. Hilaire, in which Goethe took such lively interest.² But,

¹ With regard to the orthography of the great astronomer's name, it must be observed that he often wrote it *Keppler*, with two *p*'s, as De Maistre does; but that in his Latin works it is always *Kepler*. We have left De Maistre's spelling as we found it, and hence the variation.

² Eckermann informs us that he met Goethe early in August, 1830, and that the poet said to him: 'Well, what do you think of this great event? The volcano has burst forth; all is in flames, and henceforth there is no talk of debates with closed doors!' 'It is a terrible story,' replied Eckermann, thinking of the revolution that had just upset Charles X.; 'but under such circumstances, and with such a ministry, could any one expect otherwise than that things must end in the expulsion of the royal family?' 'It seems that we do not understand each other, my good fellow,' said Goethe; 'I am not speaking of those people, but of a very different matter; I am speaking of the dispute between Cuvier and Geoffroy Saint-Hilaire, a dispute so important to science, and which has broken out in full academy. The matter is of the highest importance, and you cannot conceive what I felt, on hearing of the *séance* of July 19. We have always, however, a powerful ally in Geoffroy Saint-Hilaire. The synthetic mode of contemplating nature, which he has introduced into France, cannot be relinquished.' *Nouvelle Biographie*

in truth, the point scarcely needs discussion. It is now all but universally admitted that, even in physical science, the Platonic, as well as the Baconian, method is needed; that even in physical science a lively imagination is of the greatest possible service.

But it is quite compatible with these admissions to maintain that Bacon was still a great and serviceable reformer; that he brought out into prominence a neglected aspect of truth; and that induction, though not by itself the road to any great physical discovery, is essential to the proof of the discovery.

3. That the modern methods of carrying on scientific investigations differ considerably from those recommended by Bacon.

This statement must be accepted as a fact. Even the greatest admirers of the Baconian philosophy—witness Lord Macaulay—give up, as comparatively worthless, the rules suggested in the second book of the ‘*Novum Organon*.’ Bacon was not happy in his own attempts at inquiry into scientific detail. Without fully accepting the assertion of De Maistre, that no man was ever more ignorant of the natural sciences than Bacon, we must admit that he underrated the value of the magnetic researches of his contemporary Gilbert, and never seems to have admitted the truth of the system of Copernicus, but to have believed to the last that the sun went round the earth. And as for rules, we have seen that the great geniuses of the earth set them at defiance. In so far as they do follow rules, the best at present extant are probably those given by Mr. J. S. Mill in his great work on Logic. But then it must, in fairness, be borne in mind, that Mr. Mill is immensely indebted to the ‘*Discourses on Natural Philosophy*’ of Sir John Herschell. Now Herschell avowedly proclaims himself a disciple of Bacon.

We conclude, therefore, that the acknowledged fact of Bacon’s failure in detail, ought not to operate too unfavourably in our judgment of his achievements. Aristotle’s poetic criticism may be still allowed to be great and luminous, even though we may not think highly of the solitary ode ascribed to him. Francis Bacon may still have been a great reformer, though his general principles alone, and not his suggestions of detail, be accepted as at least embodying one side and aspect of truth.

Generale,’ *Art.* Geoffroy. (We may observe that the accounts of scientific men in this dictionary are very excellent. Many are from the pen of the editor, Dr. Hofer.) The main point at issue between Cuvier and Geoffroy Saint-Hilaire seems to have arisen from the belief of the latter in the unity of organic composition, as embracing invertebrate as well as vertebrate animals. Geoffroy’s methods, if not his conclusions, are, in our judgment, anti-Baconian. But they seem to be gaining ground. *En passant*, we may remark, that a blow of Lord Macaulay’s at the Pythagorean and Platonic dreams about numbers is unfortunate; modern chemistry believes greatly in numbers and proportions.

4. We say 'one side and aspect of truth,' for such we must maintain is the true view respecting his system. If the general tendency of our remarks be towards the abatement of the excessive eulogy bestowed upon the Baconian philosophy in certain quarters, that tendency is by no means peculiar to ourselves. It is impossible to compare the tone of the able and temperate article on Bacon, in the 'Edinburgh Review' for October, 1857, with Lord Macaulay's, in the same Review for July, 1837, without becoming conscious of the change wrought by time and the progress of physical and mental science. It is not that the works of our great countryman are less studied; quite the contrary; but that the importance of other ways of attaining truth is more keenly perceived now, than perhaps at any time since the appearance of the 'Novum Organon.'

Many inquiries we are compelled to leave untouched; for example, what are the relations between Bacon and Descartes, or Kant?—a theme discussed by Kuno Fischer. Or, again, the points of contact, amidst all their divergences, between Plato and Bacon, on which much may be learnt from Coleridge's well-known essays in *The Friend*. And, again, 'the erroneous view which regards the Aristotelian and Baconian Organon, as forming portions of the same system, and as subservient to the same end, that of physical investigation or the discovery of 'fundamental laws of the universe.'¹ Or, lastly, the points of agreement, amidst much difference, between Aristotle and Bacon, on which the student will find an excellent chapter (the fourth) in Mr. Chretien's 'Essay on Logical Method.'

But though we must pass by these points of the case, it will be necessary to say a word upon the lowering tendency of the Baconian system, *if it be made the sole philosophy of a nation*. We are, assuredly, no advocates for the restoration of the opposite extreme of scholasticism; but seeing that Lord Bacon has, like almost all reformers, somewhat overstated his case; that he has desired to make Induction everything throughout almost the entire cycle of merely human knowledge, and has unduly perhaps exalted utility in its lower sense, there is reason to fear the existence of some truth in the charge, that the too common faults of the English mind, a certain poverty of conception, an undue exaltation of common sense, a desire for immediate tangible results and consequent vulgar love of success, may have been indirectly fostered by his philosophy. His sanguine hope that his method would apply equally well to all

¹ 'Mansel, *Prolegomena Logica*, p. 169.—'Each proposes a different end; both in different ways are useful. Aristotle considers the laws under which *the subject* thinks; Bacon, those under which *the object* is to be known.'—Hamilton, ap. Mansel.

studies' has not been realized. 'Deduction,' it has been well said, 'is still in the world, and shows signs of vigorous life.'¹ His persuasion that his principle *exæquat fere ingenia*² is as untrue as ever. Genius is still genius, and no set of rules suffices, or ever can suffice, to raise common sense to the same level. With respect to the desire for immediate practical results, he is probably less obnoxious to blame, as he alludes with praise in two aphorisms often overlooked, to the existence of *lucifera experimenta ad differentiam fructiferorum*, and declares that he comes rather to be pioneer of the *light-giving* than the *fruit-bearing* experiments. So that Mr. Emerson (we quote from memory) has some ground for finding fault with Lord Macaulay as being untrue to his cause when he lays such extreme stress on mere utility as the *prime* object of the Baconian system.

It is indeed a low view on every ground. 'The only question worthy of a liberal mind as regards the result of any investigation, is not, Is it useful? but, Is it true? However fully persuaded we may be that every speculative truth has its practical advantages, to require a foresight of such advantages before entering on the inquiry, is to interpose the most effectual bar that can be devised to the progress of any knowledge, and the attainment of any benefit.' The philosopher from whom these last words⁴ are quoted supplies a happy illustration (gained even from M. Comte), in a note. Nothing could, at first sight, have seemed more useless than the speculations of the Greek geometers about the sections of a cone. How easily might a low utilitarian school have remonstrated on the idle trifling, as it must have seemed, that spent anxious hours over the distinctions between the section of a cone cut parallel to one of its sides, and the section of the same cone cut obliquely through both sides. And yet to these primarily theoretic studies do we owe the renovation of astronomy and the present perfection of the art of navigation, insomuch that Condorcet could say with perfect truth, that 'the sailor who is saved from shipwreck by an exact observation of the longitude owes his life to a theory conceived two thousand years ago by men of genius, who had before them 'simple geometrical speculations.' The curves above alluded to are found to be intimately entwined with the laws which the Almighty has impressed upon the universe. In the one curve, the parabola, moves every projectile; in the other, the ellipse, moves every planet.

We are far from wishing to throw upon Bacon the reprehension due to some of his followers. But we must, in quitting this

¹ Nov. Org. Lib. I. Aphorisms cxxvii.

² Nov. Org. Lib. I. Aphorisms cxvii.

³ Chretien, *ubi supra*.

⁴ Mansel, *Prolegomena Logica*, p. 173.

part of our subject, again express our firm conviction that the study of the Baconian philosophy needs as its proper complement, the conjunction of some more imaginative system. That of Plato is, we suspect, on every account, the best fitted for this purpose. And it is with much pleasure that we see, while we are writing this, a confirmation of our opinion from very high authority. No one has proved himself a more ardent Baconian than Dr. Whewell. Now, at this moment, Dr. Whewell is engaged in putting the Platonic dialogues into a dress adapted for English readers. Most gladly do we hail the omen.

III. It remains to say a few words respecting the relation of the Inductive Philosophy to Theology. It is the complaint of one set of thinkers, as it is the boast of another, that where the Inductive Philosophy flourishes, there we are sure to find probably Ultra-Protestantism, possibly unbelief. Let us look a little more closely into this, and see how it affects the memory of Bacon.

It has been admitted in this review, though in a different connexion, that the man who is wholly given up to inductive inquiry is very likely so to preoccupy his mind as to indispose it towards religion. But it must not be forgotten that every age has had its own temptations. The heretics of primitive times, the Roscelins and Abelards of the middle ages, the Manichæanised Albigenses and others, arose without any aid of the Inductive Philosophy. It is the undue prominence given to it, the abuse, not the use, which makes it dangerous.

Undoubtedly we consider those who boast of Theology being an inductive science as thoroughly mistaken. Induction may be of use in some divisions of that science; as, for example, in the formation of decisions in moral theology. But viewing theology as a whole, as 'the science which treats concerning God, and of creation in so far as it relates to Him,' it is not, and never can be, an inductive science. Based on the revelation of God, it necessarily starts, by deduction, from certain first principles.

The late Hugh Miller was one of the boasters alluded to. And yet we are greatly mistaken if his own autobiography, in 'My Schools and Schoolmasters,' does not well-nigh prove that he was in error. He found, and we rejoice to think it, that a personal belief in the doctrine of the Incarnation was the very life and centre of Christianity. But had he not learnt that doctrine in the Catechisms of the Scotch kirk when young, though subsequent thought was, under Divine grace, the cause of his subsequent realization of it? Pure Induction would, we feel assured, be as fatal to the creed of the free kirk as to that of any other Christian community whatsoever.

But to return to Bacon. Perhaps, in his eagerness as a

reformer, he imagined that his system was to embrace Theology. *He imagined nothing of the kind.* Not only does he expressly omit Theology from his list in the 127th Aphorism of the first book of the 'Novum Organon;' but in a passage of the ninth book 'De Augmentis' he especially opposes the case of Religion to that of the Inductive sciences; inasmuch as in religion the first principles are independent and self-subsistent (*authopystatæ, atque per se subsistentes*). And, again, a little earlier in the same book, 'Let us conclude that sacred Theology ought to be drawn from the word and oracles of God, not from the light of nature, or the dictates of reason. For it is written, *The heavens declare the glory*, but it is nowhere found written, *The heavens declare the will of God.*' And in a striking passage, quoted some years since, from the 'Advancement of Learning,' in an article of our own on 'Dogmatic Theology,' he ably contrasts the combination of Dogmatism with liberty in the Christian Faith with the licence of paganism and the rigidity of Mahometanism.

But, perhaps, Bacon did in reality desire that after all his system should extend to Theology, and sap its foundations and lead to unbelief. Let him again answer for himself. The following words occur in the preface to the *Instauratio Magna*:—

'At the commencement of our undertaking we offer most humble and earnest prayers to God the Father, God the Word, and God the Holy Ghost, that He, remembering the miseries of the human race, and the journey of this life, in which we spend few and evil days, would deign to endow the human race, through our instrumentality, with new gratuitous gifts of his own (*novis suis eleemosynis, per manus nostras, dolare*). And further we suppliantly beseech that things human may not injure things divine; and that nothing of darkness and unbelief, with reference to divine mysteries, may arise in our minds, from the unlocking of the road for the senses, and the greater enkindling of natural light.'

Let those, who dare, pronounce these solemn and noble words to be mere hypocrisy. We are not admirers of Bacon's character. Glad indeed shall we be for the honour of England, of philosophy, of human nature at large, if the new Cambridge editors can adduce, as they seem to promise, some facts tending towards exculpation.¹ But with Lord Macaulay, we think Bacon's worse self worldly, cold, and mean, and with Coleridge (who shows herein more discrimination than Macaulay), we

¹ This article, though accidentally too late for our last number, was written and partly in print before the lamented decease of Lord Macaulay. We mention this, lest our language respecting him be judged, as if it were written with reference to him when thus removed from among us. It is likewise only common fairness to the memory of Bacon to refer to the able and powerful defence of his character and actions contained in some successive numbers of the *Athenæum* for the present year. Without pretending to be fully convinced, we readily admit that these papers show that there is some room for hesitation respecting Bacon's relation to Essex, and other questionable transactions in his life.

believe that these faults did not wholly forsake him—they seldom do forsake men—in his study, and were evidenced in his treatment of Gilbert, and some of the great names of old. But he had a better, nobler, grander self, without which his scheme could hardly have been conceived, and the sad contrast between his higher and lower natures is something very different from hypocrisy.

This brings us to the posthumous work of De Maistre's. Now we do not consider ourselves as foes to the memory of Count Joseph de Maistre; thrown upon an age of wild war and revolution, and of speculation hardly less wild, his hardihood, his originality, his terse style, his sarcasm, his very recklessness, all contributed to exert a wondrous influence—an influence far more we believe for good than for evil. If he recalled any of his countrymen in Sardinia, and still more among Frenchmen, to the supremacy of Rome, those whom he thus led were in the greatest danger of acknowledging the supremacy of Satan. A more safe and sober thinker, a less reckless controversialist, a less paradoxical reasoner, would not have thus arrested the attention of the liberals and latitudinarians of his time. With the late Archdeacon Hare, in 'Guesses at Truth,' we recognise 'Les Soirées de S. Petersburg,' as 'one of the wisest and most delightful books of recent times.' But the posthumous work on Bacon is, in our judgment, below the author's proper standard, both in an intellectual and a moral point of view.¹

There is frequently, we fear, in the minds of those who look at Bacon from a decidedly Roman Catholic point of view, an undue degree of prejudice against him. They connect him, not unjustly, with the Reformation; they hear of vaunts like poor Hugh Miller's, and their judgment becomes not merely biassed, but actually warped. The very circumstance that the shock of that great and deeply needed movement evoked, as one of its indirect results, the play of such intellects as his, is an item in the formation of the most unfavourable judgment both of the man and his philosophy. Lingard shows little compassion; Dr. Newman (though he is fairer, and quotes the prayer just cited) is barely just; but De Maistre, who was a reasonable opponent in the 'Soirées,' becomes all but furious in this posthumous 'Examen.'

We cannot pause for details. De Maistre's account of Induction is untenable; but let that pass. He proves that some of Bacon's Latin expressions have a Gallican tinge. Now Bacon

¹ This inequality seems to occur also in the productions of the Comte de Montalembert, who, if any one, may be fairly considered as a sort of mental son of De Maistre.

did not execute all the Latin translations himself; but even supposing that *all* the phrases culled out by De Maistre were from Bacon's own pen, and supposing (a bold assumption) that several were not pure coincidences—what would follow hence, save that Bacon's three years' residence in France had in some degree told upon his Latinity? De Maistre gravely argues hence that he must have consorted with some French *illuminés* of the time. We should like to have seen the treatment which he would have applied to any Swiss Protestant or French sceptic, who had met him with such an argument as this.

De Maistre was a great believer in instincts. We agree with him. Now a pious French priest, the Abbé Eymery, had looked at Bacon, and compared him with the *savans* of France. To what conclusions did the Abbé's instincts lead him? He ranked Bacon, as a philosopher, among the glories of Christianity. All that De Maistre can say is, that that good man Eymery was too innocent and unsuspicious. But there is an opposite kind of instinct likewise. De Maistre himself has said that 'nothing is more infallible than the instinct of impiety.' Well, he has, we grant, found a miserable eighteenth century Editor of Bacon, who believing, as was and is the fashion with some, that every genius is an infidel at heart, has tried to torture the *obiter dicta*, and even the whole system of Bacon, into a code of unbelief. But we bethink ourselves of wiser infidels. Hume and D'Alembert were not dull; and what did they think on this matter? It is notorious that they positively reproached Bacon for his religious faith.

Among Bacon's papers was found a prayer, which begins as follows:—

'Most gracious Lord God, my merciful Father, from my youth up, my Creator, my Redeemer, my Comforter. Thou, O Lord, soundest and searchest the depths and secrets of all hearts: Thou acknowledgest the upright of heart: Thou judgest the hypocrite: Thou dost weigh men's thoughts and doings as in a balance: Thou measurest their intentions as with a line: vanity and crooked ways cannot be hid from Thee. Remember, O Lord, how Thy servant hath walked before Thee: remember what I have first sought, and what hath been principal in my intentions. I have loved Thy assemblies: I have mourned for the divisions of Thy Church: I have delighted in the brightness of Thy sanctuary . . . Thy creatures have been my books,¹ but Thy Scriptures much more. I have sought Thee in the courts, fields and gardens, but I have found Thee in Thy temples.'

Sincerely do we hope that we ourselves may not have written in a spirit wholly alien from that claimed by Bacon, when he said in his last will, 'For my name and memory, I leave it to *men's charitable speeches*, and to foreign nations, and 'to the next age.'

ART. II.—*A Commentary on the Psalms from Primitive and Mediæval Writers: and from the various Office Books and Hymns of the Roman, Mozarabic, Ambrosian, Gallican, Greek, Coptic, Armenian, and Syriac Rites.* By the Rev. J. M. NEALE, M.A., Warden of Sackville College. Vol. I., Psalm I. to Psalm XXXVIII. London: Masters. 1860.

‘PSALTERIUM sacrosanctum est divinum et admirabile Spiritus Sancti organum, variè a diversis interpretatum, vixdum intellectum, nunquam ab hæreticis corruptum, cui tot sunt mysteria quot verba.’ In these words does a paraphrast of the Psalter, in the sixteenth century, begin his work; and the sentence might well stand as a motto to Mr. Neale’s Commentary on the Psalms. For the one object which the author has had in view, in the extremely beautiful and most remarkable work of which the first volume has just appeared, is to develop the mystical—the allegorical or tropological—meaning of the Psalms. Disregarding entirely, or almost entirely, the historical and literal and grammatical sense of the text of these inspired compositions, Mr. Neale has set himself the congenial task of enucleating their deeper esoteric significance. The result is a work of singular interest to the devotional reader, and one which will open a new field of thought to theological students. But there are some classes of persons who will have no relish for these speculations, and who are disqualified by antecedent habits of mind even from comprehending them, and far less from enjoying them. And the whole tribe of literalists, and of sceptical or rationalistic critics, will be in arms against the author. For our own parts, while we welcome the present volume as a real boon to the pious reader of Holy Scripture, and while we recognise the extraordinary ability of its execution, we shall not hesitate to point out a few particulars in which we could wish that the accomplished writer had altered his method.

To speak first, however, of the special merits of the work. It is a disgrace to Anglican exegesis that it has been for the most part so bald and meagre and superficial. We know that there have been splendid exceptions; but Patrick and Whitby and Scott cannot but seem mere chaff and husks to any one who has but tasted Chrysostom or Augustine. The reproach is to be shared by most of the post-Reformational commentators. It is but dreary work to read the *Critici Sacri* or Poole’s *Synopsis* after Rupert of Deutz or S. Thomas Aquinas. It seems almost

as if the age which first pretended to have a special and exclusive veneration for the letter of Holy Scripture had lost all discernment of its still more precious spirit. The hidden depths and mysteries of the Word of God were neglected and despised by too many who laboured earnestly enough in verbal and textual criticism, and who fancied, with gross injustice to their predecessors in the faith, that they were the first to make full use of the privilege of an 'open Bible.' Bishop Horne's Commentary on the Psalms, however, deserves to be noticed as an exception from the general meagreness of his contemporaries as to the mystical interpretation of Holy Scripture. But that pious author is, after all, vastly inferior to the generality of patristic or mediæval expositors; and a want existed in our vernacular theology, which has not been fully supplied by more recent commentaries, and which Mr. Neale's present compilation is expressly designed to meet.

No writer of our day is more exactly fitted for the task of dealing with the esoteric meaning of the Psalter than Mr. Neale. It is not only that he has spent, as he tells us, more than twenty years in preliminary study, and that one of the earliest of his many literary labours was the editing of a treatise on the Psalter, left in manuscript by his distinguished maternal grandfather, Dr. Mason Good; but his remarkable acquaintance with the whole range of liturgical and hymnological literature has given him, as it were, a key to the entire system of ecclesiastical symbolism, of which the mystical hermeneusis of Scripture is the root and foundation. As joint editor, in early life, of the *Rationale* of Durandus, and part author of the Introductory Essay on Symbolism, and, in later years, conspicuous as a preacher for his grasp and mastery of mystical theology, Mr. Neale has long been known as the best qualified of our English clergy for such an undertaking as the present. He earnestly deprecates, however, any claim to originality in his commentary. He declares that scarcely one of the interpretations which he offers is his own; and his marginal notes, by their constant references to his chief authorities, confirm his assertion. But the weaving into one tissue the many coloured threads of mystical meaning which he has collected from so many sources, is his own handiwork. He presents us with a continuous commentary, in which we find condensed the most precious spiritual teaching of the best primitive and mediæval expositors. S. Augustine and Cassiodorus, S. Hilary and S. Gregory the Great, are the patristic luminaries to whom he is most indebted. Theodoret, as belonging to a school which was fond of finding intermediate historical applications of prophecy, is characteristically enough seldom or never quoted. Among the later com-

mentators are Gerhohus and Aygvan—names which will be new to many readers—Albertus Magnus, and Dionysius the Carthusian, Hugh of S. Victor, Gerson, and S. Thomas Aquinas, the later Jesuits Lorinus and Corderius, and the still more modern Portuguese preacher Vieyra. The skill and grace with which these diverse materials are worked up are very striking; but still more remarkable is the power with which the inexhaustible treasures of liturgical illustration are brought to bear on each Psalm in turn. The Antiphons of the Western Church and the Prokeimena of the Eastern, Responses and Hymns from the Syriac offices, the Mozarabic, Ambrosian, and Gallican rites, are all in turn laid under contribution. This, in fact, is the very specialty of the author; nor is he less at home in hymnology generally. Nothing can be more apt than many a verse which he quotes either in the original or in his own translation; and his illustrations include citations from classic literature on the one hand, and from the modern poets of England and Germany on the other. Sometimes, indeed, his skill and facility in rendering have led him too far; and, in defiance of Canning's warning, he presents us in one place with three stanzas of Prudentius done into English *Sapphics*, and elsewhere with some very stiff imitations of unusual metres. On the other hand, he is often very happy; and he has turned a far-fetched epigram of Hildebert of Tours in this marvellously close copy of George Herbert or Withers:

'Fisher the Father is: the world the sea,
His flesh the bait, the hook his Deity:
The line his Resurrection. Satan took
The proffered bait, and perished by the hook.'

To turn from the personal qualifications of the author to his work. The volume now published contains the first thirty-eight Psalms, and three important dissertations, the last of which is strangely enough intercalated between Psalms xxx. and xxxi. The first of these essays gives a *résumé* of the use and distribution of the Psalter in the Public Offices of the Church. This is very elaborate and instructive. When he advances from fact to opinion, the author seems to favour the weekly recitation of the Psalter as a moderate rule; but he admires more than we can do S. Maurus, S. Alcuin, and S. Leo IX., who found time, in spite of other avocations, to go through it daily. Others carried this devout practice to an absurd excess. 'It is sad,' says Mr. Neale, 'to see the custom of daily recitation degenerate into such taskwork as that of S. Dominic the Cuirassier. His ordinary day's employment was to recite two Psalters, taking the discipline all the time; but in Lent he always said three, and often more, and once informed his bio-

'grapher, S. Peter Damiani, that he never remembered to have 'spent such a day before, as he had recited eight.'

This last experience is very enigmatically expressed, and the anecdote, as being the reverse of edifying, might have been spared. The Ferial, Festal, and Monastic uses of the Psalms in the Western Church having been discussed, Mr. Neale proceeds to trace the virtual relinquishment of the Ferial order, which had already crept in before the Council of Trent, the innovations of Clement X., and then Cardinal Quignon's abbreviation and reform. The latter, as is well known, was the precedent and origin of our own Prayer-book. In the reform of the Parisian Breviary Mr. Neale finds a happy mean between the too heavy burthen of the old use and the monotonous uniformity of Quignon's scheme; and he properly laments the late Ultramontane victory over this and the other independent Gallican office-books. He proceeds to compare the Ambrosian, Mozarabic, and Constantinopolitan divisions of the Psalter.

Still more important and generally interesting than this investigation, is the explanation of the general principle of Antiphons which follows. We have never seen a more true or more beautifully expressed illustration of this essential element of liturgical construction than the following passage:—

'The same Psalm was said at Christmas, said at Easter, said in Lent, said at Whitsuntide, said on the Festivals of Martyrs, said in the Office for the Dead: it could not, at all these seasons, be recited with the same feelings, in the same frame of mind. Its different emphases required to be brought out: the same sun-ray from the Holy Ghost rested, indeed, at all times on the same words, but the prism of the Church separated that colourless light into its component rays—into the violet of penitence, the crimson of martyrdom, the gold of the highest seasons of Christian gladness. Hence arose the wonderful system of Antiphons, which, out of twenty different significations, definitely for the time being fixed one; which struck the right key-note, and enabled the worshipper to sing with the spirit, and to sing with the understanding also.'

He proceeds to show the original type and construction of the Antiphon, both in the East and the West, and its gradual curtailment in the latter to its present form; and then, taking the First and Fifty-first Psalms, he draws out their variations of meaning and application according to their respective Antiphons at the several seasons when they are used. The subject is pursued in all its branches, and with great felicity of illustration. We regret that Mr. Neale did not consider it within his scope to refer to the recurrence in the *Antiphonæ ad Introitum*, or 'Offices,' of our first Prayer-book to the primitive usage of the recitation of the whole Psalm: and it would have been an interesting digression, had he traced from its mediæval sense our present use of the word 'anthem.' We have always thought that the *verse*

part of a modern anthem, which has now come to mean merely a harmonized vocal composition distinguished from a chorus; must derive its name from the traditional way of performing that part of a formal Antiphona which was technically called the *Versus*.

The Second Dissertation discusses the principal commentators on the Psalms, primitive and mediæval; and also, though with great brevity, the subject of versions. And here we are in some respects at issue with our author. He writes, 'The two put forth by S. Jerome, both from the LXX., claim the only special notice.' Now, surely, this dictum is somewhat unworthy of the present state of sacred criticism, and in some degree disrespectful to the Hebrew verity. Mr. Neale, with a diffidence that is graceful enough in one who is known to rank among the best linguists of the time, speaks of his limited knowledge of Hebrew as disqualifying him from any critical examination of his text. He says, in his preface, 'To treat the Psalms in the same way and in the same spirit in which the mediæval commentators approached them, themselves entirely unacquainted with Hebrew, is the height of my ambition.' But is it reasonable to ignore the advantages which a better knowledge of the Hebrew text has given to us? And in spite of the canon of the Council of Trent, which attaches so sacred a character to the Vulgate version, it would seem to us more reverent in a commentator to compare it all along with the original words of inspiration. Moreover, Mr. Neale's brief statement as to S. Jerome's versions is almost misleading without the further addition, that that great scholar himself, at the instigation of Sophronius, made a new translation of the Psalter from the Hebrew original. S. Jerome, without undervaluing the older translations from the Septuagint, revised as they had been by his own hand, was alive to the superior claims of the Hebrew verity; and, as is well known, his translation from the Hebrew would have supplanted the older version of the Psalter in the authorized Vulgate, had it not been for the attachment of the faithful to the words of the more ancient form, consecrated to them by so long a devotional use. It is just the same with respect to our own two English Psalters. The older version is wisely kept in the Prayer-book, although the Bible version (as it is called) of 1611 is confessedly very much nearer the original Hebrew. This discrepancy of text is not without its disadvantages, but it is an unavoidable evil. Mr. Neale has done right, we think, in using the Prayer-book version as his text; but he need not have spoken disparagingly, as he has done more than once, of the other more accurate translation. We quite agree with him, that the Prayer-book Psalms are more vigorous and

poetical than the later recension; but the latter has its value as a literal translation of scrupulous fidelity. Mr. Neale carries his devotion to the Vulgate text so far, that in one place we find him commending Gerhobus, and 'writers of his stamp,' for looking to that exclusively, even when it is wholly inconsistent with the LXX. version, from which it was confessedly rendered.

Of course it was the most convenient plan, for an author who wished to deal principally with patristic and mediæval commentaries, to adopt the text which those authorities had used exclusively. Every one who has read S. Augustine's *Enarrations*, for example, must have felt the inconvenience of being sometimes quite unable to apply the father's arguments or speculations to either of our authorized versions. Mr. Neale has boldly taken this difficulty by the horns. Thus, for example, in Psalm xvii. 4, after giving the English text, he begins, 'The Vulgate is quite different;' and proceeds to quote it accordingly, and to apply the whole of his exposition to the substituted verse. This device is of constant recurrence; and he does not, in most of these cases, even attempt to reconcile the diverse translations.

Now, we must plainly say, that we should have liked his Commentary better had he endeavoured to harmonize some of these varying renderings; and with the aid of the Greek and the Hebrew, and the vast body of Biblical criticism which has now been accumulated, the task would be in many cases a possible one. Indeed, in some exceptional instances, which occur (so far as we can see) without any fixed rule, Mr. Neale has not hesitated to descend into the arena of verbal criticism. On some of these we shall hereafter remark; meanwhile we may protest against the implied sneer, in speaking of Lorinus, at '*learned commentaries*.' It is inconsistent with the author's own indisputable claims to scholarship and learning of the highest range; and the famous retort has not lost its point, that if God is not served by human learning, still less is He honoured by human ignorance.

It is the more to be regretted that Mr. Neale has not thought fit to undertake the task of showing how various versions may be made, in many cases, to throw light upon each other, because he is undoubtedly possessed of many gifts which would be indispensable for success in this attempt. No one, for example, has apprehended more clearly than he, that the deep and mysterious truths involved in these inspired poems are, so to say, many-sided; that you may have fathomed one or more of their undoubted meanings and applications, and yet that there may be other meanings and applications, equally certain and equally

edifying, of which you have never dreamed. *Quot verba, tot mysteria.* As Socrates is reported to have said of the obscurities of Heraclitus,—*ὃ μὲν συνῆκα, γενναῖα· οἶμαι δὲ, καὶ ὃ μὴ συνῆκα· πλὴν Δηλίου γέ τινος δέχεται κολυμβητοῦ.* This is true generally of Holy Scripture, but of no part of it more particularly than the Psalter; and it is one of the great benefits and rewards of the humble study of the written Word, that the more one reads it and meditates upon it in a right spirit, the more insight is bestowed into the deep things of God.

And this is one reason why no one need be distressed at the obscure, and even sometimes the wholly unintelligible, passages in the Psalter of our daily use. No version can be without such difficulties, and, indeed, the original Hebrew itself is full of them. The familiar phrases of the Prayer-book as they recur become invested to the mind with a traditional meaning, which may often be imperfect, and always inadequate, and yet never a fruitless one. And who does not remember, in his own experience, how many a dark clause or sentence has been irradiated by a sudden light, as some personal or accidental application has struck out a new meaning for it? It is most earnestly to be hoped that no well-meant attempt will ever be made to reform the language or the sense of our English Liturgical Psalter. Let it remain in its noble integrity, as the substratum on which we may raise any pile we choose of exegetical and illustrative learning. It is a good sign that the Plain Commentary, published some years ago, and the Commentary we are now reviewing, have both adopted the Prayer-book text, and thus may indirectly help to secure to us in perpetuity the enjoyment of this national treasure.

It is not to be denied that a prosaic translation, even if it be nearer to the Hebrew original, is far inferior in this point of view to so vigorous and poetical a version as that in our Prayer-book. Dathe's modern Latin rendering is ludicrously tame and ineffective by the side of the Vulgate. The tendency of all modern versions of this literal class is to exclude any but one superficial *primâ facie* meaning; though nothing, we are sure, can so effectually succeed in this lowering process as a metrical version, such as that by Tate and Brady, which is still allowed to hold its ground in too many places among us. When the thoughts of the Psalter are so disguised and vulgarized and eviscerated that it would be impossible for S. Augustine himself to say, in his usual formula, 'This breathes wholly of Christ,' we may be sure, that whatever be the literal accuracy, the spirit has evaporated. Let us be thankful that we retain for our daily devotional use a version which is patient of more than its primary and superficial meaning, and upon which we may build

up all the spiritual associations which the Church of God in eighteen centuries has accumulated round the Psalter.

It has always struck us, if we may be pardoned for the illustration, that a Hebrew parallelism from the Psalter, in its original language, might be compared to a solid group of sculpture in contrast to a mere pictorial delineation as an exponent of thought. Other languages, ancient and modern, will express, with more or less accuracy, a certain idea; and it is their very glory that they may be made so perspicuous as to exclude all indefinite or secondary meanings. And so a superficial picture, for example, conveys one, and only one, general thought to the mind. But sculpture is different: you may view a statue from all sides, from a hundred different points of view, and under every possible variety of light and shade. There is no exhausting the impressions it may convey to the mind. Just so is it with a Hebrew sentence. Each word is, so to say, a monument. Observe how it is built up from its root, and how perfect and self-contained it is in its finished form, with affixes and suffixes, and all the other apparatus of Semitic grammar. And then mark the subtle relation of word to word in the clause, and how each is affected by the combination. It is no wonder that many have thought that the sacred language was a Divinely organized medium for presenting heavenly truths to man's mind in a manner not altogether unsuited to the attributes of such a revelation. The truths themselves are unfathomable, many-sided, and most mysterious in their mutual relation; and the Hebrew has sometimes seemed to us to contain them *in block*,—so to say,—as if they might be approached physically from many points, and presented to the eye under infinite combinations of lights and groupings. See, for instance, in how many ways many a Hebrew sentence will bear translation into other tongues; each, perhaps, expressing some view of the truth contained, but none of them exhausting it. Certainly, the Church has never yet, we believe, entered upon the fulness of its inheritance in the Hebrew Psalter; and there is here a field in which—whatever may be the assaults of neology or rationalistic scholarship upon the language of the Old Testament—a faithful and religious criticism may do good service to the truth. We are sure that any one who aims, as Mr. Neale has done, at discovering the mystical meaning of Holy Scripture, would do well to explore the, as yet, scarcely opened mine of Hebrew philology. The Septuagint and Vulgate versions do but reflect a part of the radiance of the original; and it is impossible not to wonder sometimes what S. Augustine would have made of the Psalter, had he known it in the sacred language in which its inspired songs were first uttered,

This is a digression, but one not irrelevant to our subject. The common and obvious objections to the mystical interpretation of Holy Scripture are admirably discussed and replied to in Mr. Neale's Third Dissertation, of which we have already made some mention. He quotes some of the jejune remarks of Scott the 'commentator' on the subject, in which that over-rated writer considers it at once dangerous and ridiculous to attempt to 'discover Gospel mysteries' in the Old Testament generally; and thus contrasts the two rival schools:—

'The mystical interpretation of Scripture, as every one will allow, is the distinguishing mark of difference between ancient and modern commentators. To the former it was the very life, marrow, essence of God's Word,—the kernel, of which the literal exposition was the shell,—the jewel, to which the outside and verbal signification formed the shrine; by the latter it has almost universally been held in equal contempt and abhorrence; it has been affirmed to be the art of involving everything in uncertainty; to take away all fixedness of meaning; to turn Scripture into a repository of human fancies; to be subversive of all exactitude, and fatal to all truth.'

In his argument against the literalists, Mr. Neale first shows, that *primâ facie* the Old Testament, by the minute details which are given in particular cases, invites the belief that it must have an esoteric as well as an exoteric meaning; and then he urges that the quotations and applications of the Old Testament in the New are invariably of this kind. This is thoroughly and very strikingly done; but we may make two remarks on it. In the first place, it is unwise in our opinion to disparage literal accuracy because the literalists as a rule have never gone beyond that stage. There is no reason that those who love to dwell on the spiritual mysteries of Scripture should be careless of the letter. Secondly, it is very true, that the general style of scriptural interpretation prevalent in our Lord's time among the Jews was highly mystical, and the fact has its great value. But then it would have been well to enter a protest against the absurd extreme to which it was carried. Without some such caution, people might reasonably hesitate to accept as desirable the follies of the Talmud and Cabala. And the same moderation is necessary when we advance from the New Testament to the writings of the Isapostolic men. S. Barnabas and S. Hermas are witnesses that Holy Scripture may allowably and most profitably be interpreted mystically. But then their readers know that some of their illustrations are farfetched in the extreme, and are erroneous in matters of fact. Happily, we are not bound to believe in the existence of the phoenix, nor in the assertion that the hyæna changes its sex year by year. So again, every one must allow that the numerical symbolism of the patristic writers is often carried to excess: and a casual disclaimer

which we find in a note to Psalm xxix.—‘Of these numbers, ‘I would say with Lorinus, *Equidem non istis arithmeticiis ‘mysteriis magnopere delector,*’—might well have found its formal place in the text of this Third Dissertation. Mr. Neale would have strengthened his argument by showing that he was alive to the great danger of pushing mystical interpretation too far. ‘Which things are an allegory.’ Here we have, no doubt, a justification, and something more than a justification, of mystical interpretation. But then every one knows that no parable or allegory must be strained beyond a certain point. Mr. Neale’s own good taste has preserved him from overstepping the bounds of moderation in most cases; but he has not formally considered the limits within which it is permissible to indulge in these speculations. S. Augustine himself must occasionally be charged with exaggeration and fancifulness; as Mr. Neale himself seems almost to grant in noticing that Father’s exposition of the Thirty-fourth Psalm. And further on, upon verse 3 of the same Psalm, he alludes to ‘the wonderful coarseness of S. Augustine’s illustration’ of the passage,—which is not, however, the exact phrase that we should ourselves use in this case. But he goes on to remark, with great truth, ‘How impossible it ‘is that any, even the most excellent, of the commentators of ‘past ages should altogether satisfy the need of the present ‘generation.’

Applying the general principle of mystical interpretation for which he has contended to one or two illustrative points, Mr. Neale engages in a remarkably interesting inquiry into the scriptural use of the words Sion and Jerusalem. He shows pretty conclusively, we think, though not without exceptions, that Jerusalem, ‘the Vision of Peace,’ is appropriated to the Church triumphant, while Sion, ‘Expectation,’ is used of the Church militant. This idea is wrought out with great ingenuity, and is exemplified by very numerous instances from the prophet Isaiah as well as the Psalter. We must not, however, be supposed to accept Mr. Neale’s date, following S. Athanasius of old, and (we may add) Rudiger among moderns, of Psalm lxxix.—in which the use of Sion and Jerusalem cannot be reconciled with his hypothesis,—as being of the times of the Maccabees. There can be little doubt, we think, that though not a Psalm of the great Asaph, as its title seems to say, it is of the time of the Chaldean conquest of Jerusalem and destruction of the Temple. We think our author might have made more than he has done of the next point upon which he enlarges—the taking of the expression ‘the word’ throughout the Psalter to mean ‘the Incarnate Word.’ And he does not seem to be aware of a fact that would have strengthened his argument, viz. that the Chaldee

Targum of Jonathan frequently uses the term 'The Word of the Lord,'—יְהוָה דְּבַר—*the coessential and consubstantial ΛΟΓΟΣ*, as the correlative or translation of *Adonai*, or even of the Incommunicable Name, throughout the Psalter.¹ The Dissertation concludes with a notice of every quotation from the Psalter in the New Testament; a most useful and interesting undertaking, which throws a flood of light on the proper interpretation of the more ancient records, from which, to a Christian, there is no appeal. And then repeating his disclaimer of originality in the mystical expositions which he has brought together, our author concludes thus:—

'I claim nothing but the poor thread on which the pearls are strung. To collect them has been the happy work of many years,—work which has consoled me in trial, added happiness to prosperity, afforded a theme of profitable conversation with dear friends, furnished the subject-matter for numerous sermons. I pray God to accept it as an offering to the treasury of his Church; and to give that system, if it be his will, favour in the eyes of scriptural students which I know to be the only method by which his own, be it declaration or command, can be fully acted out, *ἐπευῶνται τὰς γραφὰς . . . καὶ ΕΚΕΙΝΑΙ Εἰσὶν αἱ μαρτυροῦσαι περὶ ἐμοῦ.*'

It now only remains for us to examine the actual commentary itself, or rather, which is all that our limits will allow, some few passages which have most struck us on perusing the volume. And first we must observe, that to an ordinary modern Biblical critic, it is very like going into a strange world to be thus transported into so completely a mediæval atmosphere. On the threshold one must bid adieu to the Masora and the Targum, to Walton, Kennicott, and De Rossi. Kimchi and Jarchi and Aben Ezra withdraw in company with Tremellius and Arias Montanus. Venema and Rosenmüller, Lengerke and Vaihinger, Hitzig and Hupfeld, Tholuck and Hengstenberg, Horne and Horsley, might as well never have lived or written, so far as this commentary is concerned. Our *ideal* commentary would ignore no branch of exegetical literature; but it is fair to say that Mr. Neale deliberately foregoes all help from modern criticism. The temptation, however, has sometimes been too strong for him: and an occasional side-blow at Calvinian heresy, or even an allusion here and there to later controversies, are somewhat out of place in a work which professedly takes us back into the devotional atmosphere of the middle ages.

The method of the commentary is as follows:—Each Psalm begins with an argument, borrowed from various sources. Then follows a notice of the various liturgical uses in which the Psalm occurs; and then the several Antiphons which have been applied

¹ See the Targum on Psalm xxxvii. 17, and Psalm lvi. 4, and Castell. in *Lex. Heptagl. in voce*.

to it. Next, each verse, or group of verses, of the text is followed by a running exposition: and finally, a selection of collects is added to each Psalm, embodying its tropological application. This idea, which is a very good one, is not altogether original. Raynerius Sneygoudanus, for example, concludes his paraphrase of each Psalm in the same way.

The Second Psalm, as one of the great Messianic Psalms, first arrests us. It is strange that the extraordinary dramatic force of this sublime composition has not made more impression on the author. He barely notices the changes of person as mentioned by Venerable Bede, but that is all. Is it not probable, we may ask, that in the Temple service the several characters of this Psalm were sustained by different choirs? This must have been the case for instance in the Twenty-fourth Psalm: and it is very likely that a similar method of recitation was in use here. It has always seemed to us that the striking difference of style between the calm flow of Psalm i. and the dramatic fire of Psalm ii. was decisive of the controversy as to whether these two Psalms are really distinct, or whether they ought to form one composition. It is evident, from S. Paul's quotation of a verse from our present Second Psalm in the synagogue of Antioch in Pisidia as being *ἐν τῷ πρώτῳ ψαλμῷ*, that in the times of the Second Temple they were regarded as one poem. But the internal evidence seems to us to be wholly against the supposition. Mr. Neale's interpretation of the fifth, sixth, and seventh verses of this Psalm is decidedly inadequate. In the former, for instance, he does not call his reader's attention to the magnificent anthropomorphic expression of the Divine contempt as laughter and derision, which is paralleled in the Fifty-ninth Psalm. In verse 6, the commentator, following Ayguan, has quite missed the true meaning of the word *לֹא*, by taking it as 'the law,' with our Prayer-book version. It is impossible not to say that his exposition of this is irrelevant verbiage—too often the resource of a commentator in difficulties. It is better to take the word as 'the decree,' with our Bible version and the LXX.; and to conclude, with the Rabbins, that some special and authoritative prophetic declaration of God is here meant. And such a decree, by the mouth of Nathan, may be found in 2 Sam. vii. 14, in which the remarkable words occur, 'I will be to him a father, and he shall be to me a son.' (Comp. 1 Chron. xvii. 13, xxii. 10, xxviii. 6.) No one but the barest literalist will in the face of S. Paul (Heb. i. 5) contend that this Nathanic prophecy was fulfilled in any son of David except Him who was also David's Lord: and the connexion of the prophecy with the Psalm seems to us to throw a flood of light on the passage in question. Nothing, again, can be more disappointing than

the timid reference to the Resurrection in explanation of the words, 'This day have I begotten thee.' Here again S. Paul himself points to the truest interpretation. But we have a still graver complaint to make against the exposition of the twelfth verse, *Kiss the Son*, &c. It is true that none of the ancient versions, except the Syriac, give the true import of the principal word כִּסּ; but as we have 'the Son' in both our English versions, there is little excuse for so important a passage being altogether passed over in silence. We need not inquire here at large how the true sense of the verse was lost by the Alexandrine translators. The ingenious suggestion of Cappellus, that the present reading *παιδελος* is a corruption from *παιδός*, is almost negatived by the fact, that the Italic, Ethiopic, and Arabic versions all read 'discipline;' and it is difficult to imagine that the error crept in before any of these translations from the Greek were made. And, again, the Targum reads *doctrina*. The Syrian translator was probably led by his own Aramæan dialect to perceive the proper meaning of the word *Bar*; but it is singular that none of the ancients seem to have perceived the necessity of a concrete instead of an abstract noun to make sense in this verse without an ellipsis.

We make our next pause at the Eighth Psalm. We are scarcely satisfied with Mr. Neale's treatment of the titles here or elsewhere; and he has failed apparently to see from the internal evidence of this exquisite poem that there is a strong presumption for its having been written in a moonlight night. This, however, has escaped the ritualists in arranging the Psalter for devotional use, and yet this might have been very beautifully brought out in connexion with a hint from S. Gregory, quoted by our author, in which the Psalm is applied to the Son of David himself when watching in prayer all night upon the mountain; of which vigil his human ancestor's watching his flock by night in the fields of Bethlehem might well have been a type. Mr. Neale seems to conclude that the title of this, as of so many other Psalms in which the word occurs, is to be understood 'To the supreme.' But there is little doubt that our own version's rendering, *To the Chief Musician*, or the *Precentor*, is substantially the right one: which may be reconciled with the τῷ νικοποιῷ of Aquila and the *Victori* of S. Jerome's translation from the Hebrew by the recollection that the chief rank among the musicians of the Temple Service may have been adjudged by competition. The 'in finem' and εἰς τὸ τέλος of the Italic and Alexandrine versions are no doubt erroneous, and result from taking a wrong Hebrew root. The words 'upon Gittith' will always be a crux to commentators, as to which opinions may fairly differ. We incline ourselves to the belief

that it means on the Gittite lute, and that there is no reference whatever to the winepress.

The Twenty-second Psalm is another one which taxes a commentator's powers to the utmost. First, there is the difficulty of its title, 'To the precentor, on [or according to] the hart of the dawn.' Mr. Neale declines to choose between the various renderings, and translates them all indifferently. If the most obvious meaning be adopted, that these words merely mean the chant or melody to which the poem was to be sung, there is no difficulty in taking the plain translation of the words without seeking for further mystery. In translating the words of the LXX. and the Vulgate, ἀντιλήψεως and *susceptione*, Mr. Neale has chosen the sense 'undertaking.' But is it not better to understand it of 'aid' or 'support,' agreeably to the rendering of the same noun in verse 19 of the Psalm?

Upon the first verse of this Psalm, so precious to Christian ears, and so familiar to us in the untranslated form in which those words as used by our Lord from the cross are given in the Gospels, Mr. Neale does not remark that the vernacular Chaldee verb, and not the actual word of the Hebrew text, was used by our Saviour. But he gives a very beautiful tradition from Ludolph, that our Lord began this Psalm, as we know, in His Crucifixion, and repeated it, and those that follow it, in succession till He reached the sixth verse of the Thirty-first Psalm, when He yielded up the ghost. The whole of the commentary on this Psalm is, for depth and fulness, wonderfully superior to the rather meagre treatment of the Second Psalm, of which we have been speaking. The seventeenth verse of this Psalm (Prayer-book version) is, as is well known, one of the most vexed questions of the Psalter. Mr. Neale ignores the controversy altogether; and we are not disposed to waste time on the late Rabbinical figment by which it has been attempted to get rid of this marvellous prediction of the details of the Passion. It is one of the least agreeable, though most necessary, duties of criticism to guard so precious a text as this against the assaults of Jewish or Rationalistic foes.

In Psalm xxv., the first of the seven alphabetic or acrostic Psalms, it is a bold thing to follow Horsley's rash example of making a conjectural alteration of the Hebrew in verse 18, in order to substitute a *Koph* for a *Resh* as the initial letter. And Mr. Neale oddly recommends his new verb as being 'the neatest word.' Houbigant and Kennicott propose a better word than this. It is, however, quite unnecessary to labour to make the acrostic perfect; for perfect accuracy was not required in the earlier forms of this artificial kind of poetry. For example, the *Beth*, *Vau*, and *Koph* verses are altogether absent from

the present Psalm, and after the final *Thou* there occurs a second *Pe* stanza — peculiarities which Mr. Neale has not pointed out.

The following Psalm, the Twenty-sixth of the Hebrew and English, but the Twenty-fifth of the Greek and Latin versions, is attributed by the heading of the Syriac translator to the time of David's exile. We fully agree with Mr. Neale in thinking, that on the contrary it is to be referred to the very early part of his life, and so to be classed with the Eighth and Twenty-third Psalms. Though it must be admitted, that the reference in the body of the Psalm to the temple and altar of God and its solemn service rather militates against a date antecedent to the consecration of Mount Sion by the Divine occupation.

Though not altogether consistently with his professed principle, Mr. Neale, as he advances in his commentary, seems to enter more freely into critical discussions. And the skill with which he does so makes us the more regret that he has not more often given us the advantage of his scholarship. Thus in Psalm xxvii. 3, it has often been questioned to what to refer the pronoun in the words 'in *this* will I be confident,' which occur in our Bible version, though the passage is obscured in the earlier English translation. In the text of his commentary our author evades the difficulty, and covers, by a skilful artifice, the perplexity in a very eloquent though irrelevant declamation. But in a note he proposes to make the word בְּזֵאת depend on the noun מִלְחָמָה preceding. In this he errs with Cocceius and Venema, and almost all the modern German critics, including Rosenmüller and Hengstenberg, though also with our own Horsley, against the general opinion of all scholars, as well Jewish as Christian, before the fifteenth century. We do not deny that both בְּזֵאת and בִּטְחִי, standing separately, might idiomatically be taken as this theory requires, viz. 'Even in these circumstances will I be confident;' but when these words are in conjunction, the first must grammatically mean to express the object of confidence. The gender of the pronoun need be no difficulty in Hebrew, in which the feminine is often used as the neuter is in Latin or Greek. And S. Augustine, though perplexed by this grammatical irregularity, interprets the clause most accurately, where he says, Si exurgat in me bellum in hanc ego sperabo. In quam? Unam, inquit, petii a Domino. Feminino genere appellavit quoddam beneficium, tanquam diceret, Unam petitionem Hanc [hanc petitionem] requiram.

Leaving criticism for a while, we now select for quotation the entire commentary on verse 2 of the Twenty-eighth Psalm, as it is, upon the whole, a very fair specimen of the style and method of the book. The passage from Gerhohus is so remark-

able, that our readers will thank us for setting it before them; and, as Mr. Neale observes, it most amply vindicates him from the charge of Monophysitism which has been brought against him. It would not be fair to omit the scholastic speculation at the end of the extract.

“Hear the voice of my humble petitions, when I cry unto thee: when I hold up my hands towards the mercy-seat of thy holy temple.”

‘And what was the time when our Lord’s hands were thus held up, save those most holy hours in which He hung upon the Cross? *The voice of My humble petitions*, in the plural, not the singular; for we may piously believe, as Dionysius says, that though only one intercession of our Lord is mentioned, yet never did He pray so earnestly and so lovingly for the salvation of the world as in the time of the world’s evening sacrifice. *Hear the voice*. It is as if He said, “I, Who kept silence before Pontius Pilate, before Annas, before Caiaphas,—I, Who replied never a word to the accusation of the false witnesses,—I now cry unto Thee, O My Father, Who canst hear the supplication of the heart as well as the voice of the mouth.” *Towards the mercy-seat of thy holy temple*. For so indeed they were stretched out to that *holy temple* which is in heaven. But there was also a *holy temple* then being reduced to dissolution, and by its very reduction becoming the *mercy-seat*; that temple which, being destroyed, was to be raised again in three days. The words of Gerhohus are so striking, that I may well quote them entire: “I, the assumed Human Nature, will cry unto Thee, O Lord: Thou art My Deity, in which I, the Son of David, am the Son of God, equally as the Father and the Holy Ghost are God: Thou art My Deity, and since Thou art the Word of the Father, keep not silence from Me,—from Me, the Human Nature, which Thou, O Word, didst personally unite to Thyself. By the voice of My Blood, crying from the ground, do Thou, O Word, so speak as to be heard even in hell, when My soul shall descend thither: make manifest that I am not like them that go down into the pit, from the weight of original, or the guilt of actual sin. For I, unstained by any sin, shall so be ‘free among the dead,’ that I also shall be able to deliver others thence, and to insult even death itself, saying, ‘O death, where is thy sting? O grave, where is thy victory?’” And the tradition is, that as it was commended the Jews, in whatever part of the earth they should be, to pray towards the temple at Jerusalem,—as we find Daniel praying towards the place where that temple stood,—so the Cross was set up in such a manner, that our Lord’s dying eyes rested on that same temple in which He had so often taught, but the worship of which He had come to abolish. S. Augustine takes it yet in another sense, as if the Lord said, “While I am crucified for those who by My death shall become Thy holy temple.” They notice on this verse how very rarely Christ prayed for any individual. There is the exception addressed to Peter, “I have prayed for thee, that thy faith fail not;” but that is hardly an exception, because in Peter He interceded for the other Apostles, as the very conclusion of that sentence shows: “When thou art converted, strengthen thy brethren.” Hence they take occasion to discuss the curious question,—whether the same prayer, if offered for one friend, has more value than it would have for each of three friends, if offered for them. And, notwithstanding the authority of S. Thomas Aquinas, the greater number of the schoolmen answer, that such is the virtue of charity, that each of the three is as much benefited as one would have been. Nay, they go further, and affirm, that if we pray for one person, our prayers are equally effectual for all those who are in the same condition as himself, whether they mention him or not; which they illustrate by the simile, that if you light a candle for

the benefit of a rich man sitting in his hall, it equally illuminates all those who are in the same chamber. S. Albertus says, neatly enough, that in these verses we have the model of all prayer: firstly, the *oratio*; secondly, the *ratio*.'

The very curious insertion of 'young rams,' 'filios arietum,' in verse 1 of Psalm xxix. in the Septuagint and all the daughter versions—adopted also by S. Jerome in his translation from the Hebrew—has been passed over unnoticed in the present commentary. It is probable that אֱלֹהִים 'God' and אֵיל 'a ram' having the same root, *νιός κριών*, in the accusative, was, in very early times, added as a marginal alternative for בְּנֵי אֱלֹהִים, and then became admitted into the text with the repetition of 'Bring unto the Lord,' so turning the Hebrew distich into a tristich in Greek. We fear that the mystical exposition of the 'young rams' must fall to the ground. The suggestion that this Psalm, so remarkable for its description of the effects of a storm, was composed during an equinoctial tornado at the Feast of Tabernacles, is far from improbable. Mr. Neale well observes, that the month of Tizri (August, September) must often have been accompanied by hurricanes, and he quotes, very appositely, Ezra x. 9, 'All the people sat in the street of the house of God, trembling because of this matter, and for the great rain.'

Psalm xxxii. has a verse (the fourth) in which all the ancient versions have gone widely astray from the original. Mr. Neale notices the variations, and quotes the corrections of Symmachus and Aquila, striving to make a better sense of the Greek. The error seems to have arisen from the LXX. having taken the first letter of לְשִׁירִי for the prefixed preposition instead of part of the radical word, and then reading פִּי as though it were פִּי 'a thorn.' It is curious enough that these wide deviations do not materially alter the sense of the passage.

We will make room for one more criticism, which, though too audacious to be admitted, has an interest of its own, to our author's mind, as having been adopted (if we rightly understand the marginal note) by Dr. Mason Good. If there can be one thing more certain than another, it is, that in verse 3 of Psalm xxxv. 'Stop the way' is a right translation of the word there used. 'But we will rather take it,' says Mr. Neale, 'Bring forth the spear and the bowstring.' And he defends this by the usual argument, that as two defensive arms have been named before, so two offensive weapons are needed here by the parallelism. He adds, 'Here the Arabic سكر, which means 'nerve, or string, comes in very well; and so we may translate 'it bowstring.' But if יִסְכֵּר is to be taken as a noun instead of

a verb, it would surely be better to translate it, with J. D. Michaelis, 'battle-axe'—the Herodotean *σάγρις* of the Persians and Scythians. We do not know where Mr. Neale finds his Arabic *skr* for 'bowstring.' Golius does not give this sense, but, as might be expected, *clausit* and the cognate meanings. In the Psalms (see xi. 2, xxii. 13) the word for 'bowstring' comes from the root *כָּרַךְ*, and the Arabic correlative is *وتر*. We find indeed under *شرع*, the meanings *tetendit* and *nervi arcus*, but this is not the word which Mr. Neale has given. In Persic, as J. D. Michaelis points out, *skr* means *longis spiculis erinaceus*, that is, 'a hedgehog;' and others have remarked that the Armenian word *sacr* also points to the origin of the Greek *σάγρις*. If, therefore, it is thought that a noun is needed here, it would be better to take it as a lance or battle-axe or 'partizan,' instead of a bowstring. But we have little doubt that 'Stop the way' is the right meaning.

In the further volumes of this Commentary, which we hope before long to receive from the press, we trust that some of our friendly hints may be taken, and that the author will add to its many merits a more consistent regard to the exact translation of the original Hebrew. We are not sure that we should not have counselled in some cases a greater reserve in borrowing certain mystical expositions than he has thought it good to adopt. It is probable, however, that most of those who read this volume with any other than an unfriendly intention will be prepared, by preliminary study, for properly understanding it. To such it will be, we do not doubt, deeply instructive. To some minds the mystical interpretation of Holy Scripture has a special fascination; and the poor and unlearned in particular are greatly attracted by it, when it is brought home to their understanding. The writer of this notice, after preaching from a text in the Old Testament on one occasion, was specially thanked by one of his hearers for 'having shown him Christ where he had never seen Him before.' But we cannot but insist on the necessity of discretion and moderation in so handling Holy Scripture. It would have been well had Mr. Neale more consistently followed the excellent rule which he lays down in one place in these words: 'I do not dwell on 'these interpretations, however ingenious and however beautiful, based as they are on so manifestly untenable an interpretation.' He adds, 'Such is the sense which the Church has 'usually attached to the words; and it would have been unpar-'donable—let that sense be as ungrammatical as it may—to pass 'it over.'

That there is a certain latent humour and playfulness in much

of the mystical interpretation to be found in the fathers and mediæval writers we have long been certain. It was the tendency of the system, and may be compared to many of the absurd speculations of the schoolmen, which they pursued with a kind of mock gravity, as though they were quite sensible of the ridiculous aspect of their argument. We suspect Mr. Neale of the same quality when we find him speaking of the 'holy ingenuity' of the authors whom he quotes. And in like manner we must take his citation, under Psalm xxv., of a most preposterous application of the fourth verse to his own individual trials by his great authority, Gerhohus. After playing upon the idea of the cock that crew for S. Peter's warning, and calling Pope Lucius his 'morning cock,' that writer proceeds,—'For 'unless I had been defended by the Pontiffs of the Apostolic See, or by some other intelligent cocks, I should have been 'long ago proscribed by the Simoniacs and Nicolaitans.'

In conclusion, it is impossible not to be struck with the wide knowledge of Scripture and the theological ability displayed in this commentary. We could have quoted hundreds of passages full of felicitous suggestions and profound thought. And the author has brought to his task the resources of most varied and extensive learning, ancient and modern. To the clergy the work will be more especially useful, and for them it is chiefly intended. It will open to many among them, we are sure, a thoroughly new view of inspiration. And numbers will owe it to this book, that they will sing their daily Psalms 'with the understanding also.' That some such aid was much wanted none will doubt; and we are truly rejoiced that it has now been afforded. For we can make these words of an old writer our own:—'Non intellectos psalmos indies deblaterare et in choro fidelium reboare vanum et ridiculum æstimavi.'

- ART. III.—1. *What is Revelation? A Series of Sermons on the Epiphany; to which are added, Letters to a Student of Theology on the Bampton Lectures of Mr. Mansel.* By the Rev. FREDERICK DENISON MAURICE, M.A., Chaplain of Lincoln's Inn. Cambridge: Macmillan & Co.; and 23, Henrietta Street, Covent Garden, London. 1859.
2. *A Letter to the Reverend F. D. Maurice, on some Points suggested by his recent Criticism of Mr. Mansel's Bampton Lectures.* By the Rev. C. P. CHRETIEN, M.A., Fellow and Tutor of Oriel College, Oxford. London: John W. Parker & Son, West Strand. 1859.
3. *An Examination of the Rev. F. D. Maurice's Strictures on the Bampton Lectures of 1858.* By the Lecturer. London: John Murray, Albemarle Street. 1859.

It was not to be expected that the Bampton Lectures of 1858 should soon pass into the oblivion into which the former volumes of the Series have, for the most part, fallen. The previously obtained and well merited reputation of their author, the success which they had achieved in the University pulpit, the metaphysical style adopted—unusual even before the learned assembly to which they were addressed—the attempt, for the first time systematically made, to carry the war into the enemy's camp—and the startling exhibitions Rationalism had recently made, both of its strength and its weakness, its audacity and its shallowness—all contributed to ensure a wide dissemination of Mr. Mansel's views amongst the many, as well as a careful attention to them on the part of philosophic readers. Books of a popular kind have undoubtedly attained a much wider reputation, but few works of the present century, perhaps, have attracted so large an amount of criticism from writers competent to deal with the questions on which they treat. Scarcely one of the many Reviews, monthly and quarterly, possessing any reputation, has omitted to notice it, with the remarkable exception of two contemporaries, who, in years past, were supposed to occupy and employ all the critical talent the country could boast of. It is no part of our province to offer criticisms upon the critical notices of our contemporaries, but we may be permitted to observe, that nearly every notice, whether favourable or unfavourable, of Mr. Mansel's Bampton Lectures, has been

written in a gentlemanly style. Many of them have been characterized by zeal for religious truth, most for calm and philosophic treatment of their subject; and though there is a remarkable amount of mistake and misconception in some, yet all, even down to the author of the notices in the '*Christian Observer*,'—an intelligent writer, who seems tied down to the Shibboleths of his party—exhibit considerable ability, and have thrown out valuable suggestions. Mr. Mansel has wisely, we think, departed from the usual practice, and in the preface to his third edition, has replied to some of the remarks of his reviewers; and, in the fourth edition, has added some further observations upon criticisms which had been made subsequently to the appearance of the third. On both sides, the controversy has been conducted with propriety and decorum. To Mr. Mansel himself the criticisms have been of some advantage, because they have afforded him the opportunity of explaining more at length passages which had been misinterpreted. The subject of the Lectures, and the abstract nature of the arguments which the author was compelled to adduce, in refutation of different schemes of Rationalism, necessarily involved considerable obscurity; and though Mr. Mansel's style is particularly clear and unembarrassed, many of his critics had misunderstood him, whilst some had misrepresented him on important points. Indeed, it was impossible it should be otherwise. Critics or reviewers are not always profound metaphysicians; and even those writers who unite depth of thought with acuteness of perception, bring to the investigation of a subject so different a style of training and education, such divergent views, and feelings open to such various influences, as to render it very difficult to find any common ground on which to meet. The very terms used by the disputants frequently exhibit such unavoidable fluctuations of meaning, that though every step of the argument is carefully watched, it is next to impossible to say where the fallacy lies, or where the disputants begin to differ; and either party is obliged to look to the conclusions arrived at, to help him to understand the processes from which they seem to emerge. Let it not be thought that we mean to represent the issue between Mr. Mansel and his opponents as a mere war of words, and a dispute about terms. The importance of the conclusions at which they respectively arrive, and the contradictory nature of those conclusions, quite cut away the ground from any such shallow attempts at compromise. Our readers will remember, or if they do not remember, we take the liberty of referring them to our article on the subject, which appeared in our April number last year. We then did what we could to render Mr. Mansel's views intelligible to the student, and explained how far we went

along with him, and as nearly as possible at what point, and on what grounds, we found ourselves parting company with him.

The publications whose titles are placed at the head of this article have, with the exception of a few remarks in Mr. Chretien's Letter, added nothing of any value to the discussion; and we have not placed them there for the purpose of making a peg on which to hang any further defence of, or attack upon, Mr. Mansel's position; though, in our remarks upon Mr. Chretien's Letter, we shall have something to say incidentally upon the main subject under discussion. Our principal object is to give our readers some account of Mr. Maurice's answer to the question, 'What is Revelation?' with its appended 'Letters to a Student of Theology.' Such notice is not indeed due to a publication which in an intellectual point of view is not worthy of its author's reputation; neither do we consider that we owe it to Mr. Maurice's character for zeal and earnestness in religion, to expose such transparent fallacies, and such misrepresentations as characterize his book from beginning to end; but we are anxious to exhibit, for the benefit of English readers, what is the real position of Rationalism, what its strength, and what its weakness is; what is the intellectual calibre of its principal supporters, and what are the arts by which they would enlist in their ranks, amongst the indifferent and the irreligious, some, who are dazzled by their claims to profound learning, and their monopoly of Christian charity. We will not say that Mr. Maurice's book contains a series of misrepresentations quite unexampled in the history of philosophical discussion; such vague accusations too much resemble Mr. Maurice's own style of declamation; but we may venture to assert that we are unable to remember any controversy in which there appears such a continuous series of misrepresentations, or which contains so many instances of the fallacy known to logicians as the *ignotatio elenchi*, as this volume of 'Letters to a Student in Theology.' That the reader may see that this avowal needs not imply that our range of reading in philosophical literature is limited within narrow bounds, we proceed to lay before him the justification of the charge which we have been preferring.

Before we begin our analysis of Mr. Maurice's volume, let us remind our readers that the three leaders of the Rationalistic movement, who still remain within the pale of the English Church, are Professors Baden Powell, and Jowett, and our author—two Oxford Professors, and the Oxford Chaplain of Lincoln's Inn. These are the men who redeem the University from the charge of apathy and dulness of intellect, which is said to have characterized it during the decade of years preceding that from which we are just emerging. Mr. Mansel we

believe to be a very good specimen of a class of thinkers who were then silent, but whose education was gradually going on, and who, as we trust, are destined to show which of the two sides can boast of the largest proportion of true intellectual culture, real comprehensiveness and enlargement of mind, and philosophical power. The three writers above-mentioned are, as we have said, the principal intellectual exponents of Rationalism. Their singular idiosyncrasies prevent their making any combined attack upon the doctrines of the Church, which they all of them agree in disparaging. Rationalism presents no single point of opposition; its chief damage being done by random attacks made upon different quarters, and its chief advantage being that it can comfortably ally itself with worldliness and total disbelief. It is not *exigant* in what it requires of its votaries, and is quite content to ignore, when it cannot approve. We have recently had occasion to notice the publications of Mr. Baden Powell, and Mr. Jowett, and the former has been since more severely handled in a contemporary review, from which we hardly expected such an exposure. We noticed how little common ground there was between the two Professors, excepting that of opposition to the truth; and when we class Mr. Maurice with them, we are obliged to add, that neither does he possess any other qualification for the place, except the same negative one. The Savilian Professor of Geometry disbelieves the Old Testament, because he cannot reconcile it with the laws of the physical universe. He represents the physical and mathematical opposition. Mr. Jowett explains away the doctrines of the New Testament, on the ground of their not satisfying certain mental conditions which he expects them to adapt themselves to, and may be said to be the chief representative of the metaphysical opponents. Mr. Maurice represents the opposition of the Eclectic School. With mathematical science he has evidently no acquaintance whatever, neither has he more than a general apprehension of moral and metaphysical science. His chief characteristic is, that he pares down the doctrines of Christianity to meet the doubts and difficulties of those with whom he comes in contact. Our readers scarcely need to be informed that the principal instance in which this tendency appears, is in his adaptation of the doctrine of a future state of reward and punishment to the supposed requirements of the nineteenth century. We have charged Mr. Maurice with an entire ignorance of mathematics; such ignorance we do not of course speak of as a fault, but only as a great misfortune. It is, in fact, the key to the interpretation of that extraordinary vagueness and inaccuracy which characterize his mind. This inaccuracy is displayed first in statements of his own, which are

in the main true, or near approximations to truth; and secondly, in his remarkable misapprehension of the arguments of those from whom he differs. Neither is this all; he frequently mistakes the meaning of the commonest words of philosophical language. Nay, his inaccuracy shows itself even in his ignorance of orthography. We know not how far the many misprints in his volume may be attributable to the same cause. If he does not care to correct the press of his own writing, he ought at least to have been careful to copy his antagonist's assertions correctly. It may seem trifling to lay stress on such small matters, but we cannot look upon it as a mere accidental circumstance that the character of authors, such as Mr. Mansel and Mr. Maurice, are consistently preserved even in the most minute particulars.

With regard to philosophical terms, we will give but one instance. The process of *elimination* is a favourite one with Mr. Maurice. The word in its derivation, is simple enough one should have thought; few people who know anything of Latin would be likely to mistake it; and had Mr. Maurice ever reached so far in algebra as simple equations involving two unknown quantities, he would have known that it meant getting rid of, and driving out the subject to which the word is applied. But it is a long word, and Mr. Maurice prefers using it, as most newspapers do, in the sense of *elicit*. It is a favourite word, and occurs not only in the volume before us (p. 385), but in previous writings of the author, and we believe always in the same mistaken sense. To eliminate ideas from facts, which he is so fond of talking about, is certainly not Mr. Maurice's intention; though we think he has been tolerably successful in eliminating much of doctrinal truth from his teaching.

We have said that Mr. Maurice's inaccuracy is evidenced, both in his own positive statements, and in his misapprehension of those of others. With the former we have little or nothing to do here. We concern ourselves directly with his misconception of Mr. Mansel's argument, and shall only incidentally allude to the other class of misstatements.

Before we descend to particulars, it may be as well to premise that the main argument of the 'Letters to the Theological Student,' is one continued *ignoratio elenchi*. If it had been the intention of the founder of the Bampton Lectures, that there should be delivered annually from the pulpit of S. Mary's a 'Summa totius Theologiæ,' Mr. Maurice's observations would have been much less wide of the mark than they are, and the electors to the lecture would have made a great mistake in choosing such a preacher with such a subject. The heads of colleges seem, however, to have borne in mind, that amongst the subjects to which their choice is limited, the first mentioned in the will of

the founder is 'to confirm and establish the Christian faith, and to confute all heretics and schismatics;' and probably the lecturer would have found some difficulty in finding room in the course of eight lectures, of an hour's duration each, in giving an exposition of the faith of the Catholic Church, on all the points of controversy into which he was led by the course of his arguments against Rationalism.

Mr. Maurice is entitled to the benefit of the admission, that no such attempt has been made in the Bampton Lectures of 1858; but if the reader agrees with us that no such attempt could have been desirable, or could possibly have succeeded in conveying any information in theology to the audience, he will be able to follow us when we say that the greater part of Mr. Maurice's attack is wholly irrelevant to the matter in hand. This observation at once disposes of all the inuendoes and invectives, profusely dispersed over the pages of this volume, against his antagonist for limiting himself to what is professedly a preliminary inquiry. We need not follow Mr. Maurice through a number of observations, as to the internal evidences which the Bible possesses, and by which it commends itself to the minds of the humble and devout,—the mode in which God manifests Himself to those who trust in Him and resign themselves to His guidance, the utter independence in many minds of faith upon reasoning, the contrast of the value of truths contained in Scripture, with the strife about documents and various readings. These are contained principally in his last letter to the unfortunate student, but the same tone prevails throughout the earlier letters. And having just pointed this out we shall not recur to this part of the subject, but confine ourselves for the present to the remark, that Bishop Butler comes in for his share of blame with Mr. Mansel, as he manifestly ought. Mr. Maurice, indeed, is far from seeing the logical necessity of this. He is, so to say, accidentally consistent. Both the Bampton Lecturer and our great Moralist were engaged in a preliminary inquiry—and neither of them has given us his thoughts upon all the controverted points of Christian doctrine. Accordingly both come in for their share of criticism.

As regards the remarks on Bishop Butler, we protest against them, as being presumptuous and arrogant in a degree we could not have expected in one who is a professed admirer, nay even a disciple. With all his reverence for the author of the 'Analogy of Religion, Natural and Revealed, to the Constitution and Course of Nature,' Mr. Maurice seems to think that 'the principles which he enforced will prove their force most when they are loosened from phrases, which he adopted chiefly from compliance with the habits of a dry and dreary period, and which' (qy. habits or

phrases) 'have not borne the test of later experience.' (P. 169.) We should be glad to see a specimen of Bishop Butler's works adapted to the taste of the nineteenth century, by Mr. Maurice. We suggest the title—'Bishop Butler's Thoughts in Loose Language for Loose Thinkers.' We really do not remember ever to have met with any thing so inapposite, or even impertinent, as the remarks upon Butler, whether in the expression of approval of his work in the general, or the disapprobation equally outspoken of Butler's style of writing, and his other shortcomings. We must give the reader a specimen, and though we are not forgetful that the presenting extracts from a work and divesting them of their context, can scarcely be done without appearing to exaggerate an author's defects, we have no alternative; and can only express our hope that such readers as may have the opportunity will refer to the work itself, not in the least doubting that persons who are possessed of the usual amount of common sense, which is supposed to be the peculiar inheritance of Englishmen, will find the book to be what we represent it.

Bishop Butler, then, is altogether regardless of *notions*, not only regardless but impatient of them; while, however, he possesses the faculty which Mr. Mansel is unhappily devoid of, of distinguishing them from *principles*.

In another place (p. 325), 'he is indifferent to a fault about notions.'

Again, he would have indignantly repudiated the *principle*, or, as we suppose Mr. Maurice would call it, the notion, that 'in religion, in morals, in our daily business, in the care of 'our lives, in the exercise of our senses, the rules which guide 'our practice cannot be reduced to principles which satisfy our 'reason.'

We quote the next passage more for its grammar than for anything else, viz. that the opening chapter of the analogy is 'concerning the impenetrable *I*, who *uses* all senses, *exerts* all 'energies, *puts* forth all thoughts.'

We next come to the assertion that Bishop Butler made a noble effort to emancipate himself from 'the religion of hoops and ruffles which enchained even his heart and intellect.' Really it behoves us to look well to ourselves, considering the present fashion of dress, lest we should insensibly relapse into the form of religion which prevailed in the last century.

To go on, we are subsequently informed that Butler would have utterly misunderstood Luther; and lastly, we are told that his statement of his demonstration is scientifically imperfect.

Now it is obvious, that if such assertions as these are to be taken upon trust, the writer who commits himself to them should

not only have established a character for scientific accuracy, but also should be able to show that he has read and understood the works which he takes upon himself to criticize. We do not think it necessary to vindicate our great Moralists from such sweeping charges as Mr. Maurice has brought against him; we should not wish to insult our readers by any such defence, as probably all of them will feel that Mr. Maurice does but condemn himself while venturing on such a line of criticism. But such treatment of Bishop Butler will serve very well to make us appreciate the similar tone of language adopted towards Mr. Mansel, for whom no one, we suppose, would claim exemption from intelligent criticism, however far any may be disposed to think him beyond the reach of Mr. Maurice's comprehension. It is very long since we have met with so striking an instance of the inconsistency, which provoked from the Roman satirist the well-known line:—

‘Clodius accusat mœchos, Catilina Cethegum.’

Almost every accusation brought against Mr. Mansel, whilst it falls quite harmless on the object of attack, recoils with considerable force upon Mr. Maurice. First and foremost is the charge of inaccuracy. Mr. Maurice accusing the Bampton Lecturer of inaccuracy! Why, Mr. Maurice is so saturated with inaccuracy, that it runs out at his fingers' ends. He does not even spell correctly; he misspells even his antagonist's name (p. 128). Other instances may be seen at pp. 219, 234, 417, 452, some of which we may charitably assign to the printer. Not only is he at fault in orthography, but his syntax fails him. Take for instance p. 263. ‘If he was the man *which* his ‘countrymen say that he was, *which* his Scotch or English ‘admirers think that he was, he must be shrivelled, distorted, ‘changed into the thing that he was not, when he became the ‘representative of a certain bundle of opinions.’ The writer is speaking of Schleiermacher, with whom, as opposed to Mr. Mansel, he evidently has considerable sympathy; but we are not touching upon opinions now, only upon the mode of expressing them. The Bampton Lecturer speaks of ‘his views in all their essential features.’ Mr. Maurice, in the very next page to that from which we have been quoting, considers this ‘a slip-slop phrase.’ The terms of censure are hardly such as we should have used ourselves, even of Mr. Maurice's vague and ungrammatical language; but the reader of the ‘Letters to a Theological Student,’ will often be reminded of the phrase in similar passages to that which we have extracted. We make but one more extract. At p. 271, we are informed that Englishmen and Germans are earnestly interested in a certain

subject, and that 'each *has* discussed it in *their* own way.' We might enlarge this list of errors considerably, if we were to quote all the awkwardnesses of expression that occur in these letters; such, for instance, as the following, p. 410:—'But because the *Thou* is a real man, &c.' We do not insist upon these, which the author may perhaps defend on the ground that he is using metaphysical language. Mr. Mansel is also a metaphysician, and uses a good deal of metaphysical language, but we have met with no such ugly expressions in his book. We should be ashamed to praise so clear a writer for understanding the rules of concord, and we might forgive a deep thinker for sometimes forgetting them, but Mr. Maurice is inattentive to the rules of grammar, and has no plea to urge why he should be considered exempt from criticism for his frequent neglect of them. But again, Mr. Maurice is not only ungrammatical in his own phraseology, but he cannot even quote correctly. He can hardly have been ignorant of the beautiful language of the authorized version 'in Whom we live, and move, and have our being.' Perhaps there is some motive which we cannot appreciate in the alteration at p. 282, of this into 'the revelation of a God in whom we are living, and moving, and having our being.' The mode of expression is a favourite with Mr. Maurice, for we have it again at p. 312, where we are informed that Hooker and Augustine had a 'deep awe' . . . 'of the Being in whom they were living, and moving, and having their being.' We do not wish to insist upon such phrases as 'Christendom morality,' (p. 422) and the like, but when we come to them we confess our inability to forget Mr. Maurice's accusation of slipshod phraseology. Again, perhaps, the following may be considered somewhat a slipshod expression (p. 17), 'S. Luke would have seized upon the fact, 'which had been always *described of*, 'as the revelation of Christ to the Gentiles.'

We proceed in order, from mere grammatical blunders, to modes of expression implying ignorance; though not directly making any false statement. Such are two or three expressions in the second page of the book. We have in the course of half a page, allusions to the speculations of Copernicus, the demonstrations of Kepler, and the devout and humble mind of Newton, and to the apocryphal story of the apple falling from the tree. Mr. Maurice could scarcely have adopted more unfortunate phraseology; and if he had read either of the recent biographies of Newton, he would hardly have spoken, we think, of the devotional, or even of the humble turn of Newton's mind: as to the story of the apple, we need not tell our readers that it rests on no foundation whatever; and if we had been asked to characterise the discoveries of Kepler, and the theory

of Copernicus, we should not have used the terms applied to them respectively by Mr. Maurice, which are nearly the most inappropriate he could have invented. The demonstrations of Kepler! Why, Kepler is the most remarkable instance in the whole range of physical science, for having discovered, by mere observation, three laws capable of exact demonstration, without being possessed of the secret key which Newton produced, and which enables every tyro in mathematics to prove them. The term speculations as applied to the Danish astronomer, is not so entirely objectionable, but very inadequately represents the state of the case, when it is remembered that Copernicus is not known as having contributed any arguments to the support of his theory beyond those of its simplicity, and that his system, though true, was not so good an account of the then known phenomena of the universe, as the Tyconic theory. These instances may be thought unimportant, but they derive their significance from the fact that Mr. Maurice calls other people inaccurate, vague (p. 204), unscientific, and the like; and such little inaccuracies of grammar and expression, are a very good index of the writer's tone of mind. In comparing the two writers, it is scarcely possible to help observing the remarkable contrast which they exhibit in this point. Whilst Mr. Maurice's work is full of these faults, we believe the Bampton Lectures are in point of accuracy of expression almost faultless. Supposing the strange anomaly of the former writer having elaborated a system substantially true, whilst the other had been proved to be in grievous error, this deficiency might have been spoken of in terms of regret rather than condemnation; but Mr. Maurice has precluded himself from the benefit of mercy at the hands of his critics, not only by looseness of expression, but by unproved accusations against his antagonist of the very faults which are most conspicuous in himself.

We are not here concerned with the sermons which are printed at the beginning of the volume, and which serve as a peg on which to hang the letters; yet they are full of the same kind of vague interpretations, with occasional instances of aiming at effect, by absurdly paradoxical statements, or the adoption of popular misrepresentations. Of this kind is the often repeated contrast between a belief in the Church, and a practical faith in Christ (p. 9); and the assertion that our Saviour was listening to the meaning and not the sound, when He heard and asked questions of the doctors in the Temple. Again, one does not expect in the work of a scholar, an endorsement of so palpably mistaken a version of the word *κατείδωλον*, as occurs in the authorised version, 'wholly given to idolatry' (p. 36). The meaning of the word is evidently 'full of idols' or images, as

we know the streets of Athens were. If this is a specimen of Mr. Maurice's scholarship, we cannot entertain a very high opinion of it. But we do not wish to generalise from a single instance; Mr. Maurice, if he does not read the New Testament in the language in which it is written, at least might be expected to be familiar with the authorised version; yet amongst other things we are told that Dionysius and Damaris were the *only* two converts at Athens, (p. 38); to say nothing of other misquotations of sentences. Again, Mr. Maurice is fond of raising up imaginary enemies; such as the people who are said to treat all heathen apprehensions of God as merely traditional (Mr. Maurice prefers the word *traditive*), or merely imaginary. We cannot say whether this may not be the mistaken view of perhaps a few emissaries of the Church Missionary Society, but Mr. Maurice ought to be well aware that the danger here is quite from an opposite quarter. It is of the very essence of the teaching of those seekers after truth, whom Mr. Maurice admires so much, to represent all religion as a spontaneous development of the human mind, reflecting on the facts of external nature, and of internal consciousness. Again, when he is most nearly right, he expresses his meaning most incautiously. There can scarcely be a more useful principle for the converter of the heathen to bear in mind than this, that error is the perversion of some truth, but Mr. Maurice makes the sweeping assertion that you can only combat any prevalent error by seeking for the divine principle of which it is the counterfeit. Is it indeed true that it is useless to combat error by showing for instance, the consequences, whether intellectual or moral, to which it leads?

Again, we think Mr. Maurice might have proclaimed his difference of opinion from Tertullian without sneering at what neither Tertullian, nor anybody else that we have ever heard of, claimed for this early writer, a 'higher inspiration and later revelation than S. Paul.' If this is a jest, it seems to us a very poor one, and entirely out of place, moreover, in a sermon. So much for Mr. Maurice's accurate acquaintance with the text and interpretation of the Greek and English New Testament. Still more extraordinary are his misconceptions of the line of argument, and general drift of passages in it. One of the most glaring instances of this occurs in the Third Sermon, where the exquisite tenderness and consummate art of S. Paul in dealing with Athenian idolaters, are urged in defence of Mr. Maurice's peculiar system of eclecticism, and singular theory of punishment. The whole passage shall be given as it stands;—

'My brethren, I have endeavoured in this sermon to set before you two methods of presenting the Gospel of our Lord Jesus Christ to men. I have

not concealed from you—indeed you are all aware of it—that the first has very powerful supporters, that it puts itself forth as *the* logical, *the* safe, *the* orthodox method. I have been able to say nothing on behalf of the other, except that it was the method of that Apostle, who, as we affirm, was God's instrument for causing His light to shine throughout the world. By the one course we silence objectors, joining, according to all precedents, in the same *auto da fé*, the representatives of the most diverse sects and schools, the most devout and the most scornful, the most earnest and the most frivolous. By the other, we claim all the most diverse sects and schools, the most devout and the most scornful, the most earnest and the most frivolous, as witnesses for the God and Father who would lead them all to His Son. By the one, we magnify immensely the skill of the particular dialectician who argues the case; we depress to the lowest point our common humanity. In the other, the man who pleads is nothing, but the race is glorified by its union with a crucified and ascended Lord. To the one method we are indebted for an exhibition of a vast amount of ingenious advocacy, of fine metaphysical reasoning; to the other we are indebted for the existence of a Christendom.

Such is the testimony of the past. How the future will speak we wait to learn. Nothing less is involved in the question, than whether the hundred and sixty millions in India shall be taught that all their mythology and all their philosophy is folly—or that God has sent His Son to claim them for His offspring; whether the masses of our own population who have been alienated from our Churches, shall be told that infidelity is false and foolish, because it holds out a hope that man may know something of the Infinite—or that God seeks that all should know Him, from the least to the greatest; whether each one of us shall accept every dogma of the Church and Bible because that is quite as likely to be true as anything else,—or shall continue to pray to Him who cannot be mocked, that He will give us in this world knowledge of His truth, and in the world to come life everlasting.—*What is Revelation?* pp. 51, 52.

Now, amidst all the vagueness of this passage, and its mixing up of things entirely beside the question which is at issue between himself and his imaginary antagonist, we trace this germ of truth, that S. Paul wisely and considerably made use of what religiousness he could find in heathens to lead them to deeper and truer views of religion. Amidst Indian superstitions, Mr. Mansel's logic, S. Paul's teaching to the heathen, the amount of dissent prevalent in England, the depression of our common humanity, the glorification of the race, we trace the one true idea which Mr. Maurice probably learned from his tutor at Exeter College, that the way to convert the heathen is to add to the knowledge which they already possess. The assertion expressed or implied that it is the only way, implies intense ignorance of the actual degradation of heathen forms of belief, and a radical misconception of the nature of Christianity as antagonistic to every form of religion besides itself. We are not concerned to defend the exact words of Mr. Sewell's teaching, which was sometimes expressed in a style of exaggeration approaching the grotesque, but we are sure the tutor would be shocked at the

eclecticism of the pupil. So great an amount of confusion of thought we have rarely met with, even in Mr. Maurice's writings. To repeat, surely there is a difference between the style of teaching necessary to induce heathens to give up their practices and submit to the true religion, and the method to be adopted towards those who either from misfortune or by wilfulness are in the position of heretics or schismatics. Really it is too absurd to see Mr. Maurice setting up for a reformer, and complaining of people in general as commonly adopting a method, the very opposite to that of S. Paul, in their efforts to convert the heathen. Does Mr. Maurice really know how missionaries proceed? The narrowness of this writer's view appears everywhere. Sometimes, as we have seen, he is attacking imaginary opponents; sometimes he feels keenly some danger, which, no doubt, is real, but which, from his limited acquaintance with the religious thought of the day, appears to him the only, or at least the principal danger of our times. It needs not be denied that there is a large class of people who ignore difficulties, who, either from disinclination or want of power of throwing themselves into others' difficulties, or from whatever cause, do not appreciate the distress of mind created by doubt and disbelief in others; but Mr. Maurice's sympathies, whilst they are entirely withheld from those whose reverence shrinks from subjecting sacred doctrines to the unsympathizing processes of human criticism, are expansive towards all who, from whatever cause, are investigating, doubting, examining, or disbelieving; and it is because Mr. Mansel cuts away a good deal of the ground from beneath the feet of such investigators, and because he is the keen opponent of eclecticism, that Mr. Maurice has been worked up into the angry temper which exhibits itself so disagreeably throughout this series of letters.

We must confess that we feel considerable weariness in following Mr. Maurice through his inaccuracies and absurdities, and some mortification at having to expose such transparent fallacies as meet us everywhere in his book; but we have undertaken to show it up, and we must go on with our task. We asserted, and promised our readers the evidence for our assertion, that the 'Letters to a Theological Student' are full of gross misrepresentations and *ignorationes elenchi*. In proceeding with this part of our task, we must draw a little upon our reader's knowledge of Mr. Mansel's book, otherwise we should have to make so many extracts that this notice would be swelled to very inordinate dimensions. We should be quite satisfied if we could induce people to read both the Bampton Lectures and Mr. Maurice's reply to them. Given common sense in the reader, we could have no doubt of the judgment he would form.

In defect, however, of his possessing or being willing to read Mr. Mansel's book, we may be permitted again to refer him to our article on the subject, which we do the more readily because in it we have not scrupled to avow a very considerable difference of opinion from Mr. Mansel; and we may lay claim to our reader's consideration on the score of impartiality, so far as difference of opinion on an important point is of value in evidence for establishing impartiality. To avoid, however, the appearance of misrepresentation, though we cannot extract the passage referred to at length, we shall refer to the pages of the Bampton Lectures (third edition, 8vo. 1859), and those of Mr. Maurice's reply, in the volume entitled 'What is Revelation?' We explained in our previous article the view of regulative *versus* speculative truth, for which Mr. Mansel is responsible. We are not aware that this particular view, or the mode of expression, have even yet made much progress, but it suits Mr. Maurice's purpose, apparently, to raise up several antagonists instead of one. He continually speaks as if this or something like it were the commonly received opinion of the day. Such is the appearance of things at p. 87 and p. 88, where we have the abettors of this view represented as teaching men 'how they 'may regulate themselves, so that they may present a comely face 'to the world distracted by no tumults, perplexed by no 'doubts'—and this, as opposed to what the author speaks of as the Church's teaching, viz. that 'God has verily manifested Himself not to the eye but to the spirit.' Now if the reader will take the trouble to alter the word *regulate*, which we have printed in italics, into *govern*, or any other word which may better represent its meaning, he will see at once that this passage has no conceivable connexion with the point at issue, whether the revelation which comes from God can be known to be more than regulatively true; and of which regulative revelation, moreover, Mr. Maurice speaks in these terms: 'a revelation of things which it was fitting to believe and do, stamped 'with the Divine authority, but bearing no witness that man is 'intended with open face to behold the glory of God, and to be 'changed into His image' (p. 87). If this is what the Bampton Lecturer meant by a Regulative Revelation, his antagonist was certainly bound to point out where in the Bampton Lectures it is said or implied. Here, then, is an instance of misapprehension resting apparently upon what may be called the equivocal use of a word to which is added a rhetorical flourish, which entirely misrepresents the theory which the writer is attacking.

Now, neither in this instance nor in others that we shall produce, do we for one moment accuse Mr. Maurice of inten-

tional deceit; we fully believe him incapable of such baseness, and we may be allowed here, once for all, to express our regret that Mr. Mansel should be unable to take the same view of Mr. Maurice's conduct. The remarkable misrepresentation which we shall have to notice next, has drawn from the Bampton Lecturer a most indignant protestation, that he cannot believe that, under the influence of any amount of prejudice or misapprehension, any one can really suppose his words to bear the construction put upon them by Mr. Maurice; he repeats that Mr. Maurice has made an accusation which is utterly void of truth, *and which he must have known to be void of truth at the moment when he wrote it down.* He adds (p. 79): 'No theory can excuse a man for distorting the words of an opponent to a sense which he must have known they were not intended to bear; and for founding upon that distortion an imputation of heresy which he must have known to be false and calumnious' (p. 79). We can agree with Mr. Mansel thus far, that we should have thought it absolutely impossible that a person of ordinary intelligence could have misunderstood the passage and the argument in question, if Mr. Maurice had not, in point of fact, misrepresented it as he has done. Again, we doubt if we should have believed the fact of such misconception and misrepresentation if we had not seen it with our own eyes; but as the fact is undoubted, we are bound to account for it in the most charitable way we can. It is a case analogous to Horace's—

'Quicquid generi demas, virtutibus addas.

We can only defend his moral character at the expense of his intellectual reputation. For ourselves we may add, that the adopting of this line of defence creates no difficulty to our mind. Only knowing Mr. Maurice by his writings, we may be permitted to say that we have never seen anything in him which indicates any other characteristic than that of an earnest, illogical mind, endeavouring to find its way out of a labyrinth of error in which it has been educated, and torn asunder by the contradictory influences to which it has been subjected, catching at truth wherever a glimmer of it could be seen, and fully impressed with the belief that the doubts and difficulties of others were as real, as sincere and genuine, as his own. We cannot doubt that he possesses such qualities of the heart, as entitle him at once to an acquittal from Mr. Mansel's charge; and we again repeat that we regret that it was ever made. We were not, however, prepared for the lamentable exhibition of incapacity presented to us in his attempted analysis

of the Bampton Lectures. He is a remarkable instance of the extent of evil caused by indulging in loose and vague thoughts. Minds of this class gradually lose all definiteness and precision, and come, as in the instance before us, to lose all power of understanding definite and precise statements. For those who have not read either the Bampton Lectures, the Strictures on them, or the Rejoinder of the Lecturer, we will give as brief an account of this particular instance of misapprehension as is consistent with rendering it intelligible.

In explaining his theory, the Bampton Lecturer had occasion to distinguish between abstract morality and morality as exhibited in precept. The distinction is a very obvious one, and familiar to readers of works on Moral Philosophy. And the language in which this distinction is clothed was almost unexceptionable. 'God,' says Mr. Mansel, 'did not create Absolute Morality; it is coeternal with Himself, and it were blasphemy to say that there ever was a time when God was, and goodness was not. But God did create the human manifestation of morality when he created the moral constitution of man, and placed him in those circumstances by which the eternal principles of right and wrong are modified in relation to this present life' (p. 77). We do not like the idea of eternal principles being modified; we should have preferred speaking of 'the circumstances under which the eternal principles of right and wrong are exhibited.' Perhaps we might even go so far as to say that Mr. Mansel's expression to which we object, suits his theory better than that which we should like to have seen substituted for it. But this by the way. This does not affect the general sense, which, as we have said, we should have thought it impossible for any ordinarily-constituted mind to misunderstand. It implies the well-known truth that morality is not dependent upon the will of God, as if He could have made what is right wrong, and *vice versa*, but is of his very essence—that goodness is involved in the very idea of God—that we can form no conception of God without implying this. Readers of the Bible, who are not philosophers, will easily see that this, which we are obliged to express in philosophical language, is close akin to the expression of the beloved disciple, 'God is love.' But though it would be an absurdity to say that God created that which is, if we may reverently so speak, part of Himself, and of His very essence, it is surely evident that God created both the beings who were to be the subjects of His law and the circumstances under which alone, as far as we can see, man could in act be obedient to the law. For instance, the precepts of the decalogue would be quite unmeaning if there were not the relations between man and

man, the relation of the sexes, the possession of property, and the like, as circumstances under which obedience and disobedience might be possible. That is to say, the abstract principles themselves would have existed, though there had been no concrete expression of them in human or divine enactments—even though there had been no created beings for whose guidance they should be expressed in words. We have no hesitation in saying that it would be impossible for God to create beings in His own image, as man was created, under a law of hatred instead of the law of love. Such expression involves a contradiction in terms; such idea is inconceivable, because inconsistent with the preconceived nature of God. Such, then, is the sentiment put out by Mr. Mansel, and such are the received doctrines of Moral Philosophy which are implied in it, and concerning which there is no longer any question amongst competent judges of the subject.

And now for Mr. Maurice's version of this;—and here we must say that we consider it a sufficient vindication of the writer from the charge of wilful misrepresentation, that he has quoted the whole passage at length, with a great deal that need not have been quoted, but which further illustrates Mr. Mansel's easy and intelligible position, that God did not create Absolute Morality, but did create what he calls its human manifestation. So that Mr. Maurice has really done his best to exhibit his own misconception in the strongest possible light. And the accusation that is brought against the Bampton Lecturer is actually that of downright heresy. The steps by which this insinuation is established are simple. It requires but a single proposition, to act as a minor premiss, to be tacked on to Mr. Mansel's major, and the conclusion comes out as clearly as the most rigid logician would wish to see conclusion issuing from premisses. It is in our eyes somewhat of a drawback to this argument that it depends wholly on an equivocation. We will exhibit it with its unfortunate ambiguous middle, and we think most of our readers will agree with us in saying that they have seldom met with an argument more conspicuously fallacious. It runs thus:—

1. The human manifestation of morality was created by God.
2. Christ is the human manifestation of morality.
3. *Ergo*, Christ was created by God.

If any one thinks we are exaggerating Mr. Maurice's absurdity, it is of no use for us to protest that we are giving his exact words, merely putting them into the form of a logical syllogism. We now give the words of Mr. Maurice, copied from p. 409:—

"God could not create Absolute Morality," that is admitted. I rejoice that it is,—the Absolute Morality must be in Him, His own Nature. "But God did create the human manifestation of Morality." What, is not Christ the human manifestation of Morality? Or does Mr. Mansel mean to set aside the words of the Creed, "Not created, but begotten?" He need not be afraid that I should suspect him of heresy. Happily, I should be very little listened to if I did. And I prize those words of the Creed too much, for their positive worth, to degrade them by turning them into excuses for discovering flaws in the faith of other men.'

We have dwelt the longer on this painful exhibition of weakness of thought, because under one aspect it may be made instructive; and the lesson to be learned from it cannot be too earnestly enforced on young readers and writers; viz. not to allow themselves in the use of forms of expression till they have thought well over their meaning, and to accustom themselves to criticise narrowly the meaning of the words, in works which profess to be philosophical. Had Mr. Maurice done so, we should probably have heard less of the influence which the religion of hoops and ruffles is supposed to have exerted on Bishop Butler's mind, and probably he might not have used the expression that Christ is the human manifestation of morality. Certainly we should have been spared the task of criticising the argument which we have just been exposing. We cannot presume to make ourselves responsible for what Mr. Maurice might have meant by calling our Saviour the human manifestation of morality. If he meant that He was perfect man, and that He was without sin, there are various modes of expression which would have more accurately expressed what he meant, and which would have saved him from the egregious fallacy we have noticed. As it is, he will have some difficulty in defending himself from the imputation to which he has laid himself open, of being an intellectual impostor.

The ambiguous middle, of which we have just presented so remarkable an example, is a favourite style of fallacy with Mr. Maurice; but we propose to give no further specimens of it, as we should not reserve place for other modes of misrepresentation in which this writer indulges. Mr. Maurice must surely be aware that he stands nearly alone, within the pale of the English Church, in his adoption of the belief of the Universalists in a future restoration of all, whether good or bad, to the favour of God, and consequently to a state of bliss. He is perfectly well aware of the connexion of this belief with his views of the nature of sin, and its extent; he knows how the holiest people regard it as a virtual explaining away of the doctrines of original sin and the atoning sacrifice on the cross. He must be aware, too, of the fascinating influence which this

doctrine must exert on our corrupt nature and unruly affections; neither can he be ignorant how it falls in with the views of sceptics of all shades of opinion; and how the Unitarian body, for the most part, eagerly adopt it. He is therefore very cautious how he expresses himself upon this subject; neither do we blame him for his carefully expressing his meaning on a doctrine, which he believes to be true, in such way as shall be least offensive to religious minds. But the mode in which he has mixed up this subject with the controversy in which he has thought proper to engage with Mr. Mansel—first appearing to represent it as the universal belief of Christendom, and then using it as a means of objection against the theory of a Regulative Revelation—we should call dishonest, if it came from any other pen than Mr. Maurice's. But we have implied before that we do not doubt his honesty. The truth is, his mind is so singularly constituted as to be unable to express itself in definite language, or to appreciate the force of it in others. The passages to which we are referring are, one in the Sermons, p. 105, the other in the Letters, p. 436. The latter only has been noticed by the Bampton Lecturer in his Rejoinder, probably because it is the less indefinite passage of the two, and the one which therefore gave him the best opportunity of the two for a reply. As we are entirely unable to see the relevancy of the first passage to the matter in hand, we will extract it, merely premising that, from its position at p. 105, immediately following the accusation of p. 103, that 'We are told that no real knowledge of the Eternal is possible; our conceptions are bounded by the finite and the visible,'—it manifestly is meant to refer to Mr. Mansel's views. The italicised word is meant to distinguish between the importance of the question that follows with the comparatively unimportant inquiry whether Bishop Butler would have endorsed Mr. Mansel's views. Mr. Maurice does not inform us whether Bishop Butler would have understood Mr. Mansel better than he would have understood Luther.

'It is,' says Mr. Maurice, 'a very great and serious question indeed, whether our patronage of Christianity is not subverting the revelation of Christ. It is a most serious question for ourselves, whether the mysteries of the Kingdom of Heaven, the eternal realities, are indeed near to us all, and whether we may know them, or whether we may allege that they are far from us, and that by the very nature of our vision it is impossible for us even with the divinest telescopes to discern them. It is a very serious question whether we have any message or not concerning the mysteries of the kingdom of Heaven, to those who are as poor as the fishermen of Galilee were; or whether we can only appeal to some vague fears which are in them, of a Kingdom of Hell,—not being allowed to tell them that the horror of the Kingdom of Hell consists in the absence of all know-

ledge of God's Righteousness and Truth and Love. These thoughts must press very heavily upon those who preach; I trust they press also upon some who hear.' (P. 105.)

The corresponding accusation in the Letters shall be given with the Bampton Lecturer's comment upon it, in order to give the reader a fair specimen of the style, both of the attack and defence.

'I now come to Mr. Maurice's heaviest imputation; an imputation which, if there is any truth in it at all, must include not only myself, but all persons who differ from Mr. Maurice's peculiar views on the question of Eternal Punishment. The language in which it is conveyed is carefully masked; yet I confess I see not how it can bear more than one meaning, if it is to serve his purpose in any way. He quotes from the Bampton Lectures a paragraph which he says "is nearly the most tremendous he ever read in a Christian writer." The author is speaking of those who deny the possibility of eternal punishment, on the ground that evil cannot exist for ever. To this objection it is replied, "The real riddle of existence,—the problem which confounds all philosophy,—aye, and all religion too, so far as religion is a thing of man's reason,—is the fact that evil exists *at all*; not that it exists for a longer or a shorter duration. Is not God infinitely wise and holy and powerful *now*? and does not sin exist along with that infinite holiness and wisdom and power? Is God to become more holy, more wise, more powerful hereafter; and must evil be annihilated to make room for His perfections to expand?" These words rouse Mr. Maurice to such a degree of indignation, that he exclaims—"If they are true, let us burn our Bibles; let us tell our countrymen, that the Agony and Bloody Sweat of Christ, His Cross and Passion, His Death and Burial, His Resurrection and Ascension mean nothing." Here let us pause a moment to see what this vehement language implies. It implies that the sufferings of Christ "mean nothing," unless they actually save, not only every man, but the devil and his angels; for less than this will not amount to the utter extinction of all evil. Will Mr. Maurice tell us what portion of the Bible is to be burnt, as asserting this universal redemption? Mr. Maurice continues: "But oh, friend! do not let us lose the lesson which this language is to teach us. What I was, in my haste, about to condemn in Mr. Mansel, is in you and me. *We* have been tolerating evil; *we* have been believing that because it exists, it may just as well be immortal. This is the unbelief which has paralyzed all our arms and all our hearts. This it is which makes us patient of baseness and cowardice in ourselves, which makes us indifferent how much of moral corruption there is in the world. We have said to ourselves, What is there in that little word, 'for ever'? Is not God good now? Yet He suffers evil. We who are pledged by the vows of our Ordination, as well as by the vows of our Baptism, to resist evil to the death,—we have been actually propagating this accursed denial, we have been investing it with sacred names, we have been making it a part of our orthodoxy. Do you think that this can go on? Is not this habit of mind destroying the vitals of the Nation, the vitals of the Church?"

'Mr. Maurice at any rate has now shaken himself free of "this accursed denial." Whatever it may have been once, it is evidently no "part of his orthodoxy" now. We must therefore suppose that the self-accusing *we* of the above passage is now no longer applicable to himself;—if indeed it is intended to be literally interpreted at all, and is not rather one of those oratorical devices which he is in the habit of employing when he finds it convenient to convey his accusations in an indirect

form. But however this may be, one thing at least is clear. The anathema which Mr. Maurice utters with such vehemence includes at least every person who holds to the doctrine contained in the above quotation from the Bampton Lectures; for he "condemns" the Lecturer on the evidence of that quotation alone. It is impossible to attach any meaning to his remarks, if they do not mean this. The belief that evil is not to be finally annihilated is the "accursed denial" which is the parent of such awful consequences: the opposite belief, which Mr. Maurice himself holds, is the only mode of escape from them. What then do his accusations mean, if they mean anything at all? They can mean only this:—that the want of a belief in the final annihilation of all evil, necessarily makes men indifferent to the extent of its existence now;—that none can earnestly strive against it, except such as have that belief. In other words: he virtually asserts that every clergyman and every Christian, unless he believes in the final salvation or final annihilation, not only of all evil men, but also of all evil spirits, is faithless to the vows of his Ordination and his Baptism,—is not earnestly endeavouring to fight against the devil and his works,—is careless whether the evil which he sees in the world is more or less in amount. If this is not the meaning of Mr. Maurice's accusation, why does he attach these tremendous words to his denunciation of this particular doctrine? If it is the meaning, what a fearful condemnation does he dare to pronounce against all who differ from himself!

'I am not fond of judging of doctrines by their supposed moral effect on the conduct of those who hold them. I have often heard it objected against Mr. Maurice's doctrine (or at any rate what the objectors supposed to be his doctrine) of the final salvation of all men, that it is calculated to make men easy and careless with regard to the commission of sin. I do not make this charge myself. I believe that it may be as little applicable to Mr. Maurice as to those who differ from him. I believe that men may be equally sincere and earnest in their warfare against evil in this life, whether they believe or not in its complete annihilation hereafter. But if this charge is unjust as regards Mr. Maurice, he has at least shown that he can retort the injustice with accumulated interest upon all who believe otherwise than as he teaches.'

We give this passage as a very good specimen of the mode in which the Bampton Lecturer has crushed his antagonist. We scarcely know whether, considering the awfulness of the subject, it would not have been better for Mr. Mansel to have abstained from this triumphant refutation; and we take the opportunity also of entering a decided protest against the opinion stated in the concluding paragraph, that sincerity and earnestness are unaffected by a belief or disbelief in the complete annihilation of evil.

'Salted with fire they seem, to show
How spirits lost in endless woe
May undecaying live.
Oh sickening thought! yet hold it fast,
Long as this glittering world shall last,
Or sin at heart survive.'

To proceed. We observed above, that Mr. Maurice's accusations recoil upon himself with great force. That the charge
NO. CVIII.—N.S. x

of vagueness thus falls back upon him, we think we have sufficiently shown. Another instance of this appears in the accusations throughout this work, either directly expressed or indirectly implied, against the Bampton Lecturer, that he does not get beyond a Preliminary Inquiry. Did it never strike Mr. Maurice that the question, What is Revelation? is somewhat of a fundamental, elementary, preliminary character? Again, the Bampton Lecturer is repeatedly condemned for being at issue with Bishop Butler, with Sir William Hamilton, with Kant, &c. We have no time to go through these charges. We can only refer the reader to the 'Examination of the Strictures,' by the Lecturer, for a most complete and successful exposure of Mr. Maurice's ignorance of these writers' real meaning, and his obnoxiousness to the very charge which he has been making. Certainly Mr. Maurice would have studied Bishop Butler to greater advantage, if he had learned from him not to exaggerate the statements of an adversary; and if he had ever devoted his attention to the mastery of a single work of philosophy, whether Bishop Butler's 'Analogy,' or Aristotle's 'Ethics,' or any other that is usually studied with a view to disciplining the mind, he would have been enabled to distinguish between an *argumentum ad hominem* intended to show up the inconsistencies of unbelief, and the evidential force with which Christian doctrine commends itself to the devotional mind.

Mr. Maurice is commonly thought to have exerted considerable influence over a certain class of minds. We neither wish to dispute this position, neither have we the means of ascertaining its truth or falsehood. We think we have shown that whatever influence he possesses over others, is not due to any argumentative powers of mind. Still there are writers, the beauty and the truth of whose writings more than atone for their logical deficiency; and if Mr. Maurice has mistaken his place in making an onslaught on the Bampton Lecturer of 1858, he may yet have suggested valuable hints for the student of theology. We have read his work carefully, and marked the passages as we read, and we can honestly say we have found scarcely anything worth the trouble of reading. After expressing our agreement with him in his sympathy for the religious movement of Evangelicalism in its antagonism to the sceptical tone which pervaded the political opinions, and the Socinian blight which was creeping over the religious mind, of the nation, we scarcely know whether there is any part of the volume that we can sanction with our approbation, whilst the whole of it is full of statements either absolutely false, or stated in very equivocal language.

Thus, we are told at page 101, that 'Christ repulsed no questions;' at page 280, that 'the Bible is unsystematical because it is in the highest degree methodical'; at page 274, 'that so long as we are busy with the terms of logic, so long we shall never arrive at the truth of things'; whilst as regards the particular attack on Mr. Mansel, he is described as a person with whom 'to get beyond terms is impossible' (p. 264); the effect of whose second sermon would have turned the writer's brain if he had chanced to hear it in his undergraduate days at Oxford; the effect of many other sermons which he heard at St. Mary's being the comparatively harmless one of chilling his heart. We refrain from quoting the expressions of approbation for and sympathy with sceptics, infidels, and blasphemers, because they are indirect, and because it is certain that Mr. Maurice has no sympathy with infidelity and blasphemy as such. To continue the list of objectionable statements, we have, p. 280, that the 'Gospel is a message concerning the Infinite, the Absolute'—that Mr. Mansel agrees with Hume in this respect, that he recommends general acquiescence in the religion of the day (p. 285)—that the proper method of proceeding in philosophy is to ascertain first what a thing is, before we can hope to know what it is not—that it is immoral (p. 301) to denounce an infidel's conclusion to a mixed audience who could not comprehend the statements or the purpose of the writer. Will it be believed that this charge of immorality is introduced with special reference to the following passage in the third Bampton Lecture:—'Those who, in their horror of what they call anthropomorphism, or anthropopathy, refuse to represent the Deity under symbols borrowed from the limitations of human consciousness, are bound in consistency to deny that God exists; for the conception of existence is as human and as limited as any others. The conclusion which Fichte boldly announces, awful as it is, is but the legitimate consequence of his premises. The moral order of the universe is itself God: we need no other, and we can comprehend no other.'

Another accusation, at p. 302, is that terms and realities are hopelessly mingled in Mr. Mansel's intellect, nay, even in his conscience: the only justification of this charge that we can discover, consists in the fact that Mr. Mansel, in conveying his ideas to others, has unfortunately been reduced to use the vehicle of language. We do not pretend to the slightest guess how far Mr. Maurice's intellect or conscience can reach without the help of language, but considering the difficulty we experience in comprehending what Mr. Maurice means, when he does condescend to the use of terms in which to clothe his ideas, we

should be heartily glad, if it were possible, to dispense with their use altogether. To proceed; at p. 313, we are informed that moral obligation is identical with moral compulsion.

Such is a specimen, and it is only a specimen, of the misstatements and misrepresentations contained in the volume entitled, 'What is Revelation?' It goes some way towards substantiating the charge made by the Bampton Lecturer (Examination, p. 84), that 'there is hardly a sentence in the book which he has not misunderstood.' This entire misapprehension of the author's meaning appears, as might be expected, not merely as regards separate statements and arguments, but is more conspicuous in the whole treatment of the subject, which is, as we have said before, one grand *ignoratio elenchi*.

Mr. Maurice has, in the first place, shown an entire misconception as to the functions and province of the Bampton Lecturer, and writes, as if he expected from a preacher whose business it was to expose the pretentious advances of Rationalism, to write a systematic treatise on religious doctrine. In the second place, he has quite misrepresented Mr. Mansel's view, and this not merely in the way of exaggerating, but in very gross perversion. Lastly, he has frequently mistaken the point of propositions which he quotes from Mr. Mansel, as well as from other authors.

There is an old saying which warns those who live in glass houses not to throw stones. We have often had occasion to remark, not so much upon the truth of the proverb, which is obvious, but upon the prevalent neglect of its warning. The present case is one of the most remarkable instances of such neglect that we can call to mind. We suppose that his dearest friends, and most ardent admirers, will scarcely claim for Mr. Maurice the praise of clearness, accuracy, and definiteness. His zeal and his earnestness are the theme of such constant encomium, that it would be impossible to deny him qualities which by common consent seem universally attributed to him. We trust that we have no desire to disparage qualities which are entitled to the highest respect. But we have ourselves, when we have charged him with vagueness and shallowness, been met with the reply that there was a good deal of earnestness about him. We object to this, because it is altogether *ἀπροσδιόνυσον*. We have the highest respect for much that we have heard of Mr. Maurice's character; a respect which is not diminished by the fact that he has engaged in a dispute for which he was singularly disqualified, and matched himself with an antagonist at whose hands he has sustained so disastrous a defeat. We have neither space nor inclination to give an account of the sharp and cutting retorts of Mr. Mansel, or to comment on

the lucid style in which he has held up the mirror to his calumniator and shown him the reflexion of the very faults which he professes to have discovered in the Lecturer. Many of our readers will, we fear, think we have devoted too much space to a matter of so small importance to the Church at large, as the judgment which is to be formed of Mr. Maurice's intellectual power. Mr. Mansel declares, that the reply which he would not have thought due to the merits of the attack, has been elicited from him by the reputation of the writer; and in adding to our notice of Professors Jowett and Powell, this exposure of another conspicuous teacher in their school, we feel that such a course is demanded of us much more by the pretensions of Rationalism, than to any intellectual power that appears in its abettors. Many of the faults of Mr. Maurice's writings are, we believe, occasioned by a charitable error of judgment with regard to doubts and difficulties of belief wherever he finds them; and this being the case, he is no doubt entitled to the most favourable construction that can be put upon his words; but when he descends into the arena of controversy, he must be content to be assailed by the weapons which he has himself chosen, and which he might, if he had so pleased, have declined.

We have placed at the head of this article the title of a small pamphlet, to which we have as yet made no allusion. Yet it calls for some notice, partly on the score of the kindly tone adopted in it, and the entire absence of acrimony which pervades it, and partly because of some acute remarks which it contains.

It will be thought strange, to any one who has read the preceding pages of this article, that a writer should appear with hardihood enough to attempt to bridge the chasm, if not between two views which are contradictory, at least between two writers who believe themselves to be irreconcilably at variance. In mitigation of the strangeness of this appearance it must be observed, first, that Mr. Chretien's pamphlet is entirely independent of, because written and published prior to, the appearance of Mr. Mansel's Examination; and, secondly, that as regards the theory of the Bampton Lectures, if the assailant has been guilty of misconception, the real difference of opinion will appear lessened, so far forth as such misconception is exhibited and admitted. Moreover, it is always, to say the least, a conceivable hypothesis, that the truth lies between the antagonistic extreme positions of two eager disputants, and in this instance Mr. Chretien prefaces his Letter by the avowal that, so far as he can judge, his own position is between the two theories upon which he undertakes to arbitrate. He considers the question at issue, judging from Mr. Maurice's point of view, to be whether we can know God, and settles it that the Bampton Lecturer is not

thus far at variance with his assailant, who, he says, gives the question an eager and impetuous answer in the affirmative. He at the same time disposes of the view that the teaching of the Bampton Lecturer will not bear being confronted with passages such as 'We who know thee now by faith;' 'In knowledge of whom standeth our eternal life,' &c. &c. Thus the difference between the two disputants is reduced to a difference as to the mode in which we know God; and here the writers are represented as adopting the respective views, the one that our knowledge of God is *regulative*, the other that it is *speculative*; the one that it is *negative*, the other that it is *positive*. The following remarks appear to us very pertinent, and seem to contain the point of Mr. Chretien's letter. The use of the terms *regulative* and *speculative* as contradistinguished from each other, at least in the sense in which Mr. Mansel uses them, is new, and accordingly Mr. Chretien very pertinently asks for an instance or example which may serve better than the abstract terms of a definition to set before the mind the respective meaning of the terms, and professes himself satisfied with the instance that our conceptions of God are regulatively and not speculatively true—but not finding any instance of a speculative truth quoted, and arguing from expressions made use of in the Lectures, he comes to the conclusion that 'on Mr. Mansel's theory, no truth whatever attainable by the human mind can be pronounced more 'than *regulatively* true.'¹—P. 21.

Now here is a question asked by a writer of a high order of mind, and it demands an answer. It may, perhaps, elicit from Mr. Mansel some further explanation, or even modification of his theory. The idea itself was put out by Mr. Mansel some years ago, in a pamphlet which attracted less attention than has been bestowed on his Bampton Lectures. And we may remark that the expressions in the Bampton Lectures fall short of the statement then made, that 'ideas and images which represent 'God as it is our duty to regard Him, are not in themselves 'true;' also that the view which seems to pervade Mr. Mansel's reply to Mr. Maurice commends itself to us as less harshly worded than many parts of the Lectures. The statement expressed above would incur our unhesitating condemnation. Our view of the theory of the Bampton Lectures has been given in the article already referred to, where it will be remembered that we expressed a hope that our disapprobation was rather of

¹ The author has unfortunately printed *speculatively* instead of *regulatively* here, unless we have entirely misunderstood him. We must enter our protest against such extreme carelessness. The mistake cannot be due to the printer but obviously proceeded from the pen of the writer.

the terms of the expression than of realities; whilst to the summing up of Mr. Mansel's view, as it stands in contradiction to that of Mr. Maurice, at p. 105 of the 'Examination,' we can give our unqualified assent. It is as follows:—

'I believe, with him, that God is revealed in Christ. But I believe also that this Revelation (while designed to answer other and most momentous purposes in the Divine Economy, which we need not speak of now) is, as a manner of teaching us the Nature of God, analogous in some degree, however fuller and higher, to those earlier manifestations in which God revealed Himself under symbols borrowed from the consciousness of man. In other words, I do not regard the manifestation of God *in the flesh*, as a direct manifestation of the Absolute and Eternal Essence of the Deity; but as the assumption of a nature in which the manifestation is adapted to human faculties and limited to a mode in which man is capable of receiving it. In this belief I think I am supported by the language of that Article of our Church which expressly asserts that the Human Nature of Christ is not coeternal with His Divinity, but was assumed, as a subsequent nature, at a certain period of time. "The Son, which is the Word of the Father, begotten from everlasting of the Father, the very and eternal God, and of one substance with the Father, took Man's nature in the womb of the Blessed Virgin, of her substance: so that two whole and perfect Natures, that is to say, the Godhead and Manhood, were joined together in one Person, never to be divided."

We are not aware that there is anything else in Mr. Chretien's letter which requires especial notice, but the courteous and forbearing tone which pervades it is pushed to an extreme which might be thought ironical. Many passages show that the writer is quite alive to the misconceptions which run through Mr. Maurice's argument against the Bampton Lecturer, and his disapproval of the strong language used by the former is not the less apparent because it is expressed only in the form of declining to adopt the same. Nothing can be more striking than the difference between the tone of the two pamphlets, and a superficial reader might be inclined to attribute the difference to the fact that the one writer feels keenly the attack made upon himself personally, and that the other writes solely in the interests of truth. Such an estimate would be wholly erroneous. The author of 'What is Revelation?' richly deserves the castigation which he has brought upon himself, and that not merely because he has mistaken his own calibre, but because he has written like one beside himself with passion, and Mr. Mansel's exposure of his opponent's arguments and assertions, though no doubt pointed by the keen sense of personal injury, has not gone beyond the bounds of legitimate controversy, except in the one instance in which he has charged his antagonist with wilfully misunderstanding his position. With regard to Mr. Chretien's view, we are at a loss to comprehend what he means by considering his position as intermediate to that occupied by the combatants, in

any other sense than as he has attempted to mediate between them. As regards the view itself, that we can know God imperfectly, as distinguished from that merely regulative knowledge of which Mr. Mansel is supposed to be the advocate, we can see no difference of opinion between him and Mr. Maurice; nor between either of them and the view advocated by ourselves in the number of this Review to which we have before referred, though we are far from claiming either of them as supporters of the particular explanations there adduced.

It is useful sometimes to descend from the abstractions of metaphysics to the concerns of common life, and we venture to suggest a question which will at once be seen to have a direct bearing on this subject. Probably there is no one who has attempted to educate a little child, but has heard the question, 'Has He got eyes?' And it may be of some importance to the philosopher to ascertain for himself what answer he should give. We do not doubt that many would differ wholly from our opinion, when we say that we as unhesitatingly answer this question in the affirmative, as we should the question if put in the form 'Can God see me?' The language which really conveys the true idea is quite inadequate to represent it more than partially. For any definition that we can frame for the eye as the organ of the sight, or of the process of seeing, the statement that 'God has eyes' or that 'God sees,' are alike untrue, and we are only enabled to decide this by the firm grasp that we possess, whether by intuition or simple inference, of the idea enveloped in the words, 'He that made the eye shall He not see?' Language, with all its power of abstraction, is but concrete when compared with thought; and it is, perhaps, the privilege of advancing holiness, to be able to divest its thoughts more and more of the accretions which are not wholly separable from them when clothed in human language.

Thus far we had written, and our sheets were in the printer's hands, before seeing the 'Sequel to the Inquiry, "What is Revelation?"' Mr. Maurice will have the last word. His adversary, with a propriety and dignity quite becoming the author of the Inquiry into the 'Limits of Religious Thought,' has intimated that he can take no further notice of such an unscrupulous opponent. The epithet is our own, and we use it advisedly; not wishing to withdraw what we have said touching Mr. Maurice's honesty, but conceiving that the charge implied by it is amply sustained by the exhibition of a series of misrepresentations, some of which might, if he had taken the trouble to understand his author, have been avoided, whilst there are others which arise from a very culpable ignorance of his own incapacity to deal with the subject.

Of the 'Sequel' we have little to say, but that it is worthy of the 'Inquiry.' It would be difficult to say which volume contains the greatest amount of misrepresentation, or which is written in the more arrogant style. Some of the more obvious misrepresentations with which the former volume abounded are acknowledged and retracted, with what might pass for candour and humility, if it were not that the accusations were too evidently proved to be evaded; whilst, with regard to the more important issue raised, there is the same illogical style of defence which has been seen to pervade the other volume. It is of no use to argue with a writer who is not affected by argument. It may, however, be of some advantage to others to hold up to their view the false statements of a book, as well as to expose its fallacious arguments. But we confess we are weary of the subject, and so, we doubt not, are our readers. We therefore offer a single specimen of the misrepresentation of fact.

'The moment Mr. Mansel's Lectures appeared, they were welcomed by a great part of the religious press of the country as *the* academical defence of Christian truths.'

Now, this is entirely false. We believe scarcely any notice of Mr. Mansel's book appeared for many months after its publication; nearly all the organs of the influential parties in the Church, and the Nonconformist journals, as well as the daily and weekly papers, attacked the volume more or less vigorously. Our own Review was, as far as we can recollect, the most favourable, and we entered protest against the main position of the Lectures; whilst Mr. Mansel has, in two at least out of the three editions subsequent to the first, added remarks vindicating his views from the attacks of his opponents. So much for the welcome they received, which appeared to Mr. Maurice so cordial that it has nearly driven him crazy. It was a sagacious observation, that 'Latitudinarians, while they profess charity towards all doctrines, nevertheless count it heresy to oppose the principle of latitude.'

We do not attempt to define how far Mr. Maurice's public professions of humility are to be taken in evidence for the existence of this grace. We do not wish to dispute Mr. Maurice's right to profess whatever he pleases, but we recommend him another time not to intersperse his professions with feeble attempts at wit, and ineffectual struggles to be sarcastic. There is one passage in which these are so ludicrously combined with the author's usual style of fallacy, the *ignoratio elenchi*, that we will present our readers with it, before we finally quit the subject. For the understanding this delightful *morçeau*, it is neces-

sary to premise that Mr. Maurice had accused the Bampton Lecturer of putting forth an 'all or nothing doctrine,' and after summing up the doctrine of his opponent as being equivalent to 'Now, you rebels, we have given you arguments such as ought to convince you; take all or reject all;' adding, 'As long as I believe the Bible, I shall hate that mode of speaking.' The Bampton Lecturer replies that these expressions are interpolations of Mr. Maurice's own making, and that they do not in point of fact appear in the 'Lectures,' and fairly enough observes, 'I am not concerned to defend that mode of speaking; it is Mr. Maurice's, and not mine.'

Now for the sequel. It occurs at p. 279.

'Mr. Mansel complains of me, because, in speaking of him and those who adopt "the all or nothing" method, I supposed them to address infidels in the words of Moses when he struck the rock; "Now, ye rebels." I did not know that Mr. Mansel or Mr. Rogers would feel hurt at being compared to the greatest of legislators and the meekest of men. I am very sorry. I will never do it again!'

We forbear to comment on this melancholy passage.

ART. IV.—*Life of Bishop Wilson.* By the Rev. JOSIAH BATEMAN. 2 vols. London: Murray.

THE two portly and handsome volumes which give us the life of Bishop Wilson are not easy reading; a consecutive perusal is a creditable achievement, involving a good deal of self-control. The impulse to turn over more than one leaf clamours, as it were, for indulgence. When that change which mere progress should guarantee is long in coming, we are apt to think that mere distance from a given point will secure it, and thus impatiently glance from beginning to middle, from the first volume to the second, in the imperious necessity for variety. But this is never the way to treat heavy books containing facts we want to know. Skimming, glancing backwards and forwards, and all the resources of weariness, only make us more keenly alive to the monotony, for the style remains the same, and the facts are lost in the superincumbent mass of diary, letters, documents, and comments, all conveying the same class of thoughts in the same somewhat artificial phraseology, more expressive of opinion and belief, than of character. We are bringing no charge against the author and compiler of the work. We doubt if a really interesting book could have been made out of the materials at his disposal. We may safely say indeed, that one volume would have been more readable than two, but the most skilful biographer would have found it hard to decide upon the right principle of choice and of exclusion. In a long, active, busy life in different spheres of duty, many subjects and occasions have an equal claim to notice; but if they all have to be recorded, and the actor's part chronicled in pretty nearly the same words, we seem to be always reading the same thing. We must, however, also bear in mind, that the biographer has in his thoughts not so much the general reader as the members of that party of which the Bishop was at one time a leader, who might resent abridgment, and who, he might reasonably hope, would be sustained by enthusiasm for his subject through any amount of labour which should result in a knowledge of his mind and conduct in all the great questions and events in which he was concerned. Mere amusement has never been Mr. Bateman's aim; he has acted on the principle that any light or trivial details would detract from the value of an essentially religious biography. The author of '*Adam Bede*,' in a previous work, describes an old lady taking late in life to this class of reading, who, to stimulate her interest in the study,

was in the 'habit of first looking to the end of every life to see what disease the good man died of, and having thus established a fellow-feeling, she would next seek for any earlier facts, as, whether he had ever fallen off a stage-coach, whether he had married more than one wife, and in general for any adventures or repartees recorded of him previous to the epoch of his conversion; then, glancing over letters and diary, wherever there was a predominance of sacred phrases and notes of exclamation, she turned to the next page, while such promising words as "small pox," "pony," or "boots and shoes," at once roused her attention.' We are not disposed to be hard on Mrs. Linnet for these secular propensities, for the life of man is made up of trifles, and we cannot form a correct idea of him till we are told how he meets them; but she would have found little to interest her in the columns before us, not so much by far as in the biographies of Wesley, Newton, Cecil, or Simeon. For one reason, such matters might have seemed unduly familiar to an editor deeply impressed with the solemnity of his task, and who, as nephew and son-in-law of the Bishop, could scarcely have written with the necessary freedom; and for another, that the life of Daniel Wilson is one of such extraordinary success, subject to so few mischances, trials, and disappointments, compared with that of other men, that it presents no such salient points, and has no casualties. The biographer has clearly been driven to make the most of what he had, as prominence is given to the fact of his once being wet through in crossing the Mersey when 'deputation' to the Church Missionary Society.

We are inclined to think it one of the mistakes of the present intellect-worshipping age, to over-estimate those qualities which constitute originality; to see this one point by itself above its real worth as a power, to expect too much from men of genius. Now, unquestionably, original thinkers have a foremost place somewhere, but the business of the world does not seem to us to be done by them, and certainly they do not draw the world's prizes. There is a quality, not directly intellectual, which, when a thing has to be done, or a point carried, or a work achieved, is of more avail than any amount of mere intellect, and possesses a far greater direct working influence, and that is, a strong will. Force of will will carry a matter where mere acuteness of brain, working in the same cause, will utterly fail, perhaps from this very acuteness obtruding all opposing points and showing every side of the question. Self must be identified with an idea—a strong personal interest must give it a body, as it were—before there is energy enough to give the impulse. What we mean is something more than zeal, though constantly associated with it, it is the instinctive recognition of a theatre of

action which shall develop every resource and give all the faculties full play. It is the human alloy which so often gives a love of truth, or what we deem truth, its working power. Of course, no common qualities are implied in steadiness of purpose and consistency of aim; there are not many men who maintain through their lives one fixed object. Those that do, need little more than common sense, by which we mean, the instinct to use obvious natural means adapted to their ends, to win success. Energy of character forces its way to the fulfilment of its destiny. It need not be a high destiny—many of the greatest intellects wholly lack the power of accomplishing a career—but it is a wondrous engine, a quality which in many a ‘great man’ is by far his most conspicuous quality. Once set going, it is he that carries out enterprises, rules the opinions of the masses, alters the face of the world, and wins the world’s rewards. A man of strong will and perseverance, possessed by an opinion, spreads that opinion, and stamps it upon his day; or, laying himself out to accomplish practical results, brings about those results. All the world’s monuments are fruits of this force; no permanent step is gained without it. Men love to be ruled; they trust people who know their own minds and have themselves no misgivings; they are led by those who assume to be leaders.

This may seem rather a pompous exordium to the life of Daniel Wilson, but it is a train of thought which has naturally arisen from the perusal of his biography, through which alone our idea of him is formed, as, beyond the vaguest popular report, we have neither direct nor indirect means of knowing him through any other source. Whatever his intellectual powers, they were not such as could leave their impress upon paper. Few styles are so heavy, so utterly unrelieved by fancy, enthusiasm, or originality, as that of every portion of his composition laid before us; it is not even natural; the simplest fact expressed with ease arrests us as a refreshing novelty. Few styles, we may add, are more vague, so that for pages together no one can gather a definite meaning out of it—so much so, that where he seems to affirm a fact, his friends explain that he probably did not mean what he seems to mean. But there nevertheless stands out from these pages a course of quite extraordinary success, a career marked out and achieved, a party guided and kept together, a diocese ruled with a high hand, and a cathedral and many churches in England and in India left standing records of his energy, his powers of persuasion, and his personal liberality. Without going the length of a contemporary (the *Christian Observer*), ‘that it was scarcely more difficult, humanly speaking, for the shepherd boy to rise to the

'throne of Israel than for a London apprentice to become the 'Metropolitan of India,' we must concede it a remarkable position for force of will and concentrated energies, under such circumstances, to have attained.

All events are providential. Each Bishop of Calcutta has been a providential appointment. But, speaking of second causes, Daniel Wilson's elevation is a singular testimony to his personal qualities, due, we must say, as much to the deficiencies as to the strong points of his mental and physical constitution. If there had been play of fancy or a poetical imagination, these must have drawn him from time to time from his course, and marred its unity. But owing to a total absence of the discursive faculties, his consistency met with no obstruction. Once satisfied, he was always satisfied. With an end before him, there was nothing in him to call him aside, no teasing doubts, no subtle questionings. Everything that he took in at all was plain to him, for he saw only those points in a question that adapted themselves to his nature, and which he felt it his mission to enforce and propagate. And as he was incapable of poetical aspirations, which imply a certain want or yearning, so he was exempt from the pains of satiety. He was absolutely without the need for change in his intellectual diet. Intent on holding the world to his own standard, that standard never varied a hair's breadth. In a period of great religious excitement he never changed an opinion or mode of expressing it, so that his first sermons were available through his whole course. In a period of extraordinary activity of thought, when the world was flooded with works of genius, he had not a moment's temptation to lave in that stream; and his biographer notes it as a fact, that he never read one of Walter Scott's novels. At a time when the press overflowed with a religious literature, he held to his early teachers, and read Scott's Commentary every day for sixty years; and would fain have restricted the entire world to that pasture, having been at great cost and pains to provide the French nation with a translation, and himself buying every copy in of the original that came in his way for redistribution. But it is time to enter into detail, to give the reader the grounds of our opinion.

Daniel Wilson was the son of Stephen Wilson, a silk manufacturer of Spitalfields, and a member of a family of some mercantile importance; who is briefly described as a gentleman, a true Christian, a kind father, and a good master; methodical in his habits, and quiet in his temper. His mother was a woman of strong religious feeling, whose family had been intimate with Whitfield. His earliest religious ideas were derived alternately from Mr. Romaine, of S. Anne's, Blackfriars,

in the morning, and from the Tabernacle in the afternoon; but from the time he was apprenticed to his uncle, a strict, 'conscientious Churchman,' he gave up the Dissenters, and listened exclusively to the teaching of such Churchmen as Romaine, Crowther, Cecil, Scott, Basil Woodd,—men who had no doubt the power of making themselves listened to, and impressing their views on their hearers. Daniel Wilson describes himself in childhood and boyhood as utterly without religion; and one of his contemporaries remembers his behaviour in church as ostentatiously irreverent: but nevertheless, he listened to the sermons, and seems to have imbibed their principles, and retained them unchanged to the end of his life. Any momentary compunction developed what was to be the master-passion of his life—preaching. One of his earliest recollections was the habit, on some transitory impression of religion, of getting on a chair, selecting a text, and preaching to his schoolfellows; and we may observe, that through life he found this exercise the invariable remedy for spiritual declension. He had been sent at seven to a preparatory school, and at ten he was removed to Hackney, to be under the care of the Rev. John Eyre, former curate to Cecil, and then the 'pious and respected minister of Ram's Chapel,' whom he held through life in affectionate regard. Indeed, the reverence and affection he retained for his early teachers is a point which deserves especial notice;—he never swerved from them, and never accepted any other guides. He took the mould of this zealous but narrow party before he caught their spirit or was roused to practical action by their teaching. Nevertheless, many indications lead us to doubt whether religious influences were not earlier at work in his inner consciousness than he ever assumed. A definite hour of conversion is so inexorable a demand with this school, that it must be an object of eager search to every soul desirous to be satisfied of its present state. But it transpires that his earliest exercises were on religious and moral subjects, and that religious questions were continual topics of discourse. He had been apprenticed (1792) when fourteen to his uncle, a silk manufacturer in Milk Street, Cheapside, who resided with his family at the house of business, and ordered his establishment after the old rigid fashion,—held everybody strictly to the long business hours of the week, and enjoined attendance on all religious ordinances on the Sunday.

'The master's eye is everywhere, and in his presence all is order and decorum. But when the day draws to a close and he retires, restraint is thrown off and discipline relaxed. The young men gather together, conversation is let loose, jokes are practised, words are unguarded, disputation is aroused. The topic of religion is familiar to them, and is commonly discussed without reserve. One finds his amusement in it, a second quiets

conscience by it, and a third excuses sin. Amongst them is Daniel Wilson, with high intellect, high powers, high aspirations—all checked and held down by SELF—in some of its linked forms of self-esteem, self-will, or self-indulgence. Such was his natural character. The *Grace of God* began to work upon this character; and a conflict ensued between the old nature and the new; between the flesh and the spirit; which never ceased till death.—Vol. i. p. 8.

Young people will talk about Calvinism if they hear much of it; it has a peculiar fascination to them, which years in most cases entirely wears off. Children even throw themselves with avidity into the controversy, set Divine justice against irreversible decrees, freewill against foreknowledge, till all seems plain and easy to them; their own arguments have such force on their own minds that they wrangle and chatter in the expectation of settling the question. It is on this ground that a Calvinistic discourse fills us with sadness—its effect on the young. Older people take it with a stolid calm, whether they agree or differ, but it sets children too often on an irreverent chase, which it is difficult to suppose can lead them to good. The young Daniel, who never disputed what his teachers taught, argued from their doctrine the absolute worthlessness and uselessness of means, and questioned the value of prayer. We find him writing soon after this period—

“As far back as I can remember, my whole heart was given to sin. Even when a boy at school, when particular circumstances recur to my mind, I am shocked at the dreadful depravity of my nature as it then discovered itself. I have indeed proceeded in a regular progression from the lesser sins of bad books, bad words, and bad desires, to the grosser atrocities of those emphatically known by ‘the lusts of the flesh.’ I was constantly acting against a better knowledge. I had received a religious education, and had been accustomed to a regular attendance on public ordinances. I could criticise a sermon, and talk and dispute about particular notions; but I loved my sins, and could not bear to part with them. I never had gone so far as to deny any one doctrine of the Gospel. I acknowledged them to be true, but for want of that necessary attendant, self-application, I could hear whole sermons—but not a word belonged to me! I took a false idea of the Gospel, and from this distorted view, dogmatically pronounced it out of my power to do anything; and so, hushing my conscience with ‘having done all I could,’ I remained very quietly the willing slave of sin and Satan.”—Vol. i. pp. 6, 7.

‘This record of himself,’ says Daniel Wilson’s biographer, ‘may no doubt be true;’ but there is observable in him from the first such an instinct to know what *ought* to be said under every conceivable circumstance, that even his best friends are at fault, and we find the contemporary already referred to making a merit of this vagueness, while it seeks to exculpate him (we incline to think with reason) from the self-charge of gross violation in act and deed of God’s law. ‘We are inclined to believe that this view ‘of himself may, perhaps, in some measure, partake of the strong

'colouring and exaggeration which were his temptations in after life. But even exaggerated pictures of our own weakness and corruption are offences easily pardoned. The whole bent of the heart is apt to be in the contrary direction. The contrite publican returned to his house the justified man.' Such a line of argument is certainly open to question; the case bears another solution. Such confessions, couched in such language, he had heard from distinguished preachers all his life. It would seem to him an essential part of conversion to use every term of self-abasement, without too nice an adjustment to actual fact, which might savour of a lurking self-righteousness. Nor would he have any reason to fear any real loss of estimation in his teachers by any confession of sin previous to conversion. Witness the following passage from his report of an interview with Mr. Cecil, which exhibits a certain rivalry of self-accusation:—

"I then related the abiding desire of my soul towards this work, and the different steps which had brought me before him as a judge. He inquired the manner and time of my conversion; and when I mentioned (as I could not but do), the dreadful lengths of iniquity into which I had sunk, he stopped me, when I called myself 'the chief of sinners,' to put in his claim to that character; and this was the point in which he said he exceeded every one: that he kept a kind of school of infidelity, and used to have a number of young men and teach them to ridicule the Bible, &c."

"I told him I had not abilities for that, or else I am sure my heart was bad enough."—Vol. i. pp. 39, 40.

In the same way we are left in the dark as to the 'wicked discourse' which led to his sudden awakening:—

"One evening (March 9, 1796) I was as usual engaged in wicked discourse with the other servants in the warehouse, and religion happening (humanly speaking, I mean) to be started, I was engaged very warmly in denying the responsibility of mankind, on the supposition of absolute election, and the folly of all human exertions, where grace was held to be irresistible. (I can scarcely proceed for wonder that God should have upheld me in life at the moment I was cavilling and blaspheming at his sovereignty and grace.) We have a young man in the warehouse whose amusement for many years has been entirely in conversing on the subject of religion. He was saying that God had appointed the end—He had also appointed the means. I then happened to say, that I had none of those feelings towards God which He required and approved." 'Well, then,' said he, 'pray for the feelings.' I carried it off with a joke, but the words at the first made some impression on my mind, and thinking that I would still say, that 'I had done all I could,' when I retired at night I began to pray for the feelings. It was not long before the Lord in some measure answered my prayers, and I grew very uneasy about my state."—Vol. i. pp. 8, 9.

This 9th of March is henceforth a noted day in Mr. Wilson's calendar, yet we are disposed to think it owes some of its distinctness to the need of a fixed moment, for we find him afterwards, in answering a question of his mother's:—

"You ask me the particular day from which I date my first convictions. I am indeed unable to inform you to a certainty, but I generally reckon it
NO. CVIII.—N.S. Y

to be the 9th of March, 1796. The circumstance itself will never, I trust, be effaced from my mind; but as I have already acquainted you with it some time back, I shall not now repeat it.

“Pray for me, my dear mother, that I may observe the return of that day in a proper manner. It would more accord with my own inclination, and more conduce to the tranquillity of my mind, could I spend it in fasting and prayer; but as my opportunities are so very circumscribed, I think I cannot do less than go to see Mr. Eyre, whose love to me will I hope be amply repaid, not by my poor gratitude, but with the blessing of heaven into his own bosom.”

“The purpose thus expressed was carried into effect. The 9th of March found Daniel Wilson in company with Mr. Eyre, and the natural desire to know what passed on an occasion so interesting, may be to a certain extent gratified; for notes of the conversation are still extant. They serve to show the general nature of the intercourse which took place between them, and the kind of instruction and encouragement communicated by Mr. Eyre, and are the more valuable, because none of the many letters which must have been written by him from time to time have been preserved.

“The notes were taken from a memorandum made by Daniel Wilson, and were inclosed to his mother in a letter dated March 17, 1797.—Vol. i. pp. 22, 23.

There is such evidence of an instinct to adapt every feeling to a system, that, if he had been in another school, the manifestation would probably have been different. However, there is no doubt it was the school most congenial to his nature, and the moment that his conscience was roused, his knowledge of similar cases left him in no doubt what to do. We have given the history of the 9th of March. On the 11th we find him stating his case with great proficiency of language to his late schoolmaster, Mr. Eyre. His biographer rejoices in the absence of all timidity in the prompt action which followed the first conviction of sin, which is certainly highly characteristic:—

“This uneasiness led him to immediate action. There was none of that concealment or delay so common and so hurtful to the growth of conviction in the soul. On the 9th March it might be said of him, as it was said of S. Paul, “Behold he prayeth;” and on the third day after, that is, on the 11th March, he was conferring with Mr. Eyre, as with another Ananias, on the “things that accompany salvation.” The effect of prayer was most strikingly manifested in his case. God heard in heaven his dwelling-place, and every religious feeling prayed for, was roused at once to life and action. But all was confusion. His eyes were opened, but he saw nothing clearly. And those very arguments which served to exclude truth before, now stood as stumbling-blocks in his search after it.

“His first letter to Mr. Eyre under these circumstances, deserves an attentive perusal; for few young persons, when thus brought suddenly under conviction of sin, are able to describe the tumult of their minds so clearly.

“*March 11, 1796.*

“I hope you will excuse my freedom while I lay before you in a simple manner the state of my mind. In consequence of the religious education I have received, I am theoretically acquainted with the leading features of the Gospel, and though I acknowledge with shame how little practical influence they produce on my conduct, I have never rejected one doctrine

of the Gospel, neither have I imbibed any of the pernicious principles of Socinians, or any other heretical sect.

"But what is to me a great stumbling-block is the idea which I have entertained, on the supposition of its general reception among the Calvinists, concerning election. This doctrine I have conceived to mean that all the true children of God are elected by God before the foundation of the world. Now, my wicked heart argues thus:—If this be true, how can the endeavours of a weak man assist or impede the accomplishment of the divine decrees? If God hath fore-ordained that I shall be brought to a knowledge of himself, how can anything I do or say prevent the designs of his omnipotent will? Thus do I sometimes think to myself."

"In a word, I know not what to do. I feel no love to God or Christ. I do not see the wickedness of my sins in such a hideous light as my conscience says I ought. My heart is hard. I find more pleasure in the enjoyments and levities of this world than in thoughts of futurity. What I have done I am afraid is insincere. For though I refrain from any outward acts of sin, my mind is for ever mingling in the worst scenes of wickedness. I know not what to do. But I have resolved to write to you as a person who I have the greatest reason to think has a sincere regard for my present and future welfare, and I beg your consideration of my case, and hope you will pity and advise me.

"What I think that I most want to know, is:—Whether a conscientious reformation of my outward life is in the least accessory to my future safety? Whether the endeavouring to lift up my heart to God in prayer when it is cold towards Him, is not daring presumption? And what part of the Scriptures you would particularly recommend to my perusal."—Vol. i. pp. 9—11.

This experience of certainly not more than forty-eight hours, so easily unfolded—this state of mind in a youth of eighteen, so readily marked out and portrayed, shows, what we observe throughout, a total absence of reserve and timidity; active and busy, Mr. Wilson must work out every feeling on the spot. To muse, to brood, to speculate, were foreign to his character. This change of feeling threw him at once into a bustle of action, dignified by his biographer into a 'period of anxiety':—

'The anxious state of his mind may be gathered from the fact, that, although this letter was written on the 11th March, and he had since seen Mr Eyre personally, yet he writes again on the 16th as follows:—

"Since I saw you on Monday my situation is but little altered. I feel the seeds of wickedness as strong as ever, and although they do not burst forth in profane or unbecoming expressions, or in wicked actions, yet my thoughts are too much allied to the world, and too little fixed on eternal things. If any worldly subject is talked of in my hearing, I find my vile heart hankering after it; and though I have been enabled (dare I say, by God's grace?) to abstain from opening my lips, yet my Bible says that God searcheth the heart; and if such be the case, I am sure my transgressions are infinitely increased every day I live.

"I often think of what you said, 'Is not sin your burden?' But my heart answers, or I think it answers, 'I would wish to feel this burden, but, woe is me, I do not.' Sometimes in the daytime when sitting at the books, or walking in the streets, I endeavour to pray for an interest in the Saviour; but alas; I feel little need of Him, and my blind mind cannot

discern how I am to know that God will accept me, and blot out my sins through the blood of Christ. In short, I utter words with my lips; I groan and sometimes weep over my situation; and yet I can refer it to no cause."—Vol. i. pp. 11, 12.

His state of mind is next communicated to his parents. His mother writes with the question, 'How is it between God and your soul?' which he answers at once and with a formality of technical language, describing the natural reaction from excitement in so distinct a theological formula as constitute this whole transaction, genuine in its main features, as it undoubtedly was, one of the most remarkable instances of adaptation we know. Every suitable expression is at his fingers' ends; nothing is out of its place, nothing is fresh, nothing belongs to him in a different sense from the whole human race. We next read of interviews with Mr. Newton, who we have always noticed to have a style of his own in contrast to so many of that school who have not. To him he describes his state, and enlarges on his defects with that unflinching composure and self-reliance which are his uniform characteristics. Let any constitutionally modest man try to tell every person he converses with that 'he is a sinner,' and he will realize the courage, and, in a certain sense, the self-estimation the task requires. Daniel Wilson began to be known. His state of mind excited 'general interest' amongst leading men: he had interviews in which they seem now and then to be pushed to rather strange arguments to reconcile him to himself; he wrote letters, he reported his soul's progress, lamented over backslidings; he filled whole pages about himself, sometimes detailing doubts, sometimes denouncing himself in the strongest terms, which would have more effect on the reader if we did not seem to have heard them word for word before. His biographer reverently follows every change of feeling, and ushers in each extract with a solemn phrase, as, 'a dark and cloudy day;' 'the heavens grew black with clouds and rain;' 'the clouds return after the rain.' At length we come to the following letter, to his mother, of complex emotions, where, if the dejection is real, the expression of it is surely conventional:—

"You know me not, my dearest mother, or else I am sure you must hate me; for, to a gracious heart, such a complication of inbred corruption and outward transgression as constitute my character, must, I am sensible, be altogether loathsome and detestable. I have great reason to fear that I am one of that awful number whom God hath given up to final obduracy and impenitence, and who are constantly increasing their condemnation by the opportunities of grace they daily abuse, and concerning whom the Almighty has declared, that he has 'no pleasure in them.'

"The hearing of the Gospel, and the reading of God's Word produce no effect on my obdurate heart. All the invitations of the Gospel are useless, all its threats produce no terror. The old serpent has been trying long to have my soul, and now he has it fast. He rules in it. He reigns over it.

And I, his wretched slave, obey it in the lusts thereof. I verily am persuaded that my evil tempers have a more absolute sway now, than when I never knew I had a soul to be saved—or what amounts to the same thing, when I never thought seriously about it. My dear mother, it is not willingly that I distress your mind with the account of my dreadful state. To you, heaven is safe, and I rejoice in it; though I believe you will never meet there your poor son.”—Vol. i. pp. 24, 25.

‘From this dark cloud,’ says his biographer, ‘the following letter darts like a flash of lightning.’ It is not necessary to give the letter, its subject is sufficient to throw some light on the change of tone; for it is on preaching. His was a mind to work its way to its own ends; he had energy and an instinct which led him to success. From the first moment of ‘conversion,’ he was feeling his way towards a more congenial life. While he was dark and dull, while the ‘clouds’ and the ‘rain’ on which his biographer rings the changes, oppressed him, he was weighed down by a life of drudgery utterly uncongenial with his mental occupations, and below his sense of his own powers. His spirits were cast down; he struggled on as a learner, laying his case before this and that spiritual adviser, and seemingly gaining no ease. A friend of his took to preaching; a spark was kindled; he began to give advice, to suggest texts, to see how they ought to be handled, and made telling and awakening. On this new impulse, we note a sudden change, a happier phase of existence at once sets in; as we gather from the following passage, though the biographer recognises no such system of cause and effect as we think may be traced:—

‘Words so bright from a soul so dark, are very remarkable: to be accounted for partly by the peculiarities of a character itself full of striking contrasts, and partly by the fact that the communication of spiritual gifts is to a great extent independent of the enjoyment of them.

‘The attempt to benefit his friend seems to have had a good effect on Daniel Wilson’s own mind, by withdrawing his attention somewhat from himself. Nor was it an isolated act. In letters written about this time, he is found rejoicing over two of his fellow-servants, who last year were “children of wrath,” but are now “plants of grace.” He writes to one of his sisters, pressing religion on her attention; and mentions his purpose of writing to another on the same subject. He endeavours in a similar way to comfort his mother under some domestic affliction. And thus, watering others, he appears to have been watered himself; and at length to have found “rest to his soul.” It came like “the morning spread upon the mountains,” and in the use of God’s appointed ordinances. The account is as follows:—In a letter written to his mother on August 23d, 1797, he uses this expression: “Remember me to Mr. Eyre. I intend writing to him soon on a subject which has lain on my mind these three months.”—Vol. i. pp. 26, 27.

This subject was the Holy Communion, on the reception of which Mr. Wilson writes to his mother with more individuality (though with the same remarkable unreserve) than is usual in his style. To his friend, on the same occasion, he adds with fervour:—

"Yesterday and to-day have been, I think, the happiest days I ever remember. The Lord shines so upon my soul that I cannot but love Him, and desire no longer to live to myself, but to Him. And to you, I confess it (though it ought perhaps to be a cause for shame), that I have felt great desires to go or do anything to spread the name of Jesus; and that I have even wished, if it were the Lord's will, to go as a missionary to heathen lands."
—Vol. i. p. 29.

In the course of a few days from this time he opens out to his friends his desire to enter into the ministry. The earnestness of his desire, and the motives which influenced him, no doubt constituted a vocation. There are persons who will feel this so strongly as to object to our view of the history of his conversion up to this step. But there is a natural side to all that is told, of which the biographer gives no hint.

When of two religious parties one invariably goes through a fixed period called conversion, ushering in a total change of feeling and desires, and thinks the process essential to the life of religion in the soul; while the other, realizing itself as from infancy the subject of divine ordinances and privileges, can indicate no exact moment of change, but believes in, and traces in its own experiences, a gradual work in the heart and affections; a fanning from a spark into a flame; when both schools (we take the devout, sincere exponents of both as examples,) seem to act out their several principles, we are set to study the phenomenon of this unvarying consistency to a theory. In Bishop Wilson's case, his change of heart, his entrance upon a religious course, is, like his whole career, in exact conformity to the teaching of his theological school, probably because his nature exactly fitted him to be its exponent. Not a stage is missing, not a step misplaced. There is the first deadness in sin, the sudden awakening, the sense of guilt, the long discouragement, the final triumph of faith, the dedication of himself to a life-work, all expressed in the precise terms sanctioned by the use of thousands of predecessors in the same course. We cannot help seeing a natural side to all this, a character and temperament which give the mould, and form an outward development of the inner impulse. Let no one cavil at our natural interpretation of much which in this work is attributed solely to spiritual agency and direction, unless they can contradict it: for where it is the custom of so many who occupy the teacher's chair to demand from every conscience a fixed moment of conversion as a sign of being in the state of salvation, we are justified in analysing those cases on which the theory is founded, for the comfort and encouragement of many a doubting timid soul; and in pointing out that an unbiassed observer may take a different or largely modified view of even the most marked example. We may, for instance, trace strivings of the Spirit, and responses to these divine impulses

before the given hour; and while system demands an utter heathen deadness of heart in the subject of our speculations, may feel certain that these spiritual monitions would have filled a much larger place in the memory and experience of one trained in another school, and been connected with a long chain of similar teachings, and so traced back to the earliest dawn of memory. Not that we take exception to the term conversion, as applied to either a sudden or gradual change of heart in the baptized Christian, but experience, and a comparison of what we see with what we so constantly read and hear; the discrepancy between observation as far as our own range extends, and the statements of biographies, and the demands of a school of immense popular influence, forces us upon investigation and inquiry.

Daniel Wilson's vocation was not immediately acknowledged; his father stoutly opposed it at first. He had fixed him in business, and expected him to remain in it; and his old tutor was cautious not to oppose this providential obstacle. But it was an occasion for strength of character to have its legitimate play, and the energy here was so real, the purpose so strong, expressed too with such filial propriety in its perseverance, that there could not be any long opposition. His master befriended him, when assured that he 'should never make a good tradesman, he had never loved business,' that now 'his dislike was increased, and that even when dead in sin he had always kept up his school-learning.' He consulted various ministers, amongst others, Rowland Hill. We do not observe that they detected in the young apprentice that adaptation for the work he desired, as he felt in himself. They did not recognise the popular preacher in embryo; and with some reason, for his subsequent success was the result of an extraordinary industry and devotion to his calling, which cannot be reckoned on, rather than in marked natural gifts. His manner too, we can imagine, not attractive; and Rowland Hill, Cecil, and Newton were all men who might be alive to the defects of an address and tone derived from the companionship in which the young convert had lately lived. Rowland Hill thought him young both in years and grace, and reminded him of the text, 'Not a novice, lest being puffed up he fall into the condemnation of the devil.' And in his call on Mr. Cecil, the first words were:—

"I understand you have views to the ministry. Now Providence seems to have cast you into a different line, and I suppose you have serious reasons for wishing to go out of it."—Vol. i. p. 39.

And on subsequently admitting that the call was real:—

"This being settled, I mentioned that my father was doubtful whether I had qualifications for a minister. In reply to this, he observed, 'that if

none but men of genius and shining parts were to be in the ministry, there would be few indeed ! It was not genius nor great abilities that ever saved a soul ; and that even a dull understanding with industry in the use of means, and a heart set on the work, might form a very useful man. He knew some ministers now of that character, who had improved themselves so much by diligence and study, that they were as useful as any men of the day.”—Vol. i. p. 40.

In the meanwhile, his tutor, Mr. Eyre, had acted, according to the biographer's phraseology, as *days-man* between the son and his father. And here it may be noted, that whenever a scriptural phrase can be turned to announce a fact, or to express a feeling, it is made to do so in preference to the writer's own words. The effect is constantly trite, and not seldom irrelevant ; and the practice always seems to want accounting for. Is it to surround the subject with a halo of sanctity ? is it because the biographer has his style so essentially built upon quotation that words cannot come out singly ? or is it really easier, considering the opportunities for criticism that relationship and near connexion produce, to adopt at once a technical language, and not trust to spontaneous, unrestricted expression ? It is no doubt extremely difficult to speak of those nearest to us in a public manner ; to distinguish between their figure to the world and to our accustomed eyes ; we have to put ourselves in another position towards them, which in fact renders relations the worst biographers, and their task one of the most difficult : but constant recourse to Scripture phrases will not solve the problem. The same practice pervades Bishop Wilson's private writings, and not seldom seems the resource of a strong determined will sheltering itself, or justifying itself, under seeming guidance and direction ; as where, twice, we read, after singular triumphs of vigorous, active determination producing its natural fruit of success, ‘The Lord has led me by a way that I knew not.’ Once, on this occasion when he had carried his point, and was going to College ; and again, when at his own request he was made Bishop of Calcutta. But, as we write, this hardly seems a case in point, for perhaps man may never realize that he himself is (whether justly or not) a more blind instrument of Providence than when he feels impediments give way before his own strong will. Bad men of this temper think themselves the favourites of Destiny, religious men the mere arm of Providence. But we have no time for such wide speculations. In the case before us, a more than common insensibility to the value and just use of words, observable throughout, is sufficient to account for every inaccuracy or vagueness of expression.

Mr. Wilson was at once entered at St. Edmund's Hall, but, previous to residence at Oxford, he was placed under the care of

Mr. Josiah Pratt, curate to Mr. Cecil, to whom he subsequently gives this testimony :—

“I owe to him,” he says in 1845, “under God, and to two or three other eminent men, the entire guidance of my mind when I first entered seriously on the care of my salvation, and the earnest study of theology :—the Rev. Thomas Scott, the commentator, from 1796 to 1798 : then in 1798 the Rev. Josiah Pratt : next at St. Edmund’s Hall, Oxford, the Rev. Isaac Crouch : and lastly, in my first curacy, from 1801 to 1803, the Rev. Richard Cecil. These continued uninterruptedly my most intimate friends, till their several deaths. But to no one was I more attached than to him, who was spared to me and to the Church the longest—the Rev. Josiah Pratt—my honoured brother.”—Vol. i. pp. 43, 44.

From the first, the course of the young student was in the fullest degree consistent with his profession and his character. He had, according to the reported testimony of him who had bid him ‘pray for the feelings,’ while still in Milk Street, burnt all books of a ‘light or irreligious’ character, and shown himself quite another man to his companions, being not only most anxious to get good himself, but to do good to others. He now applied himself with ‘indefatigable diligence’ to his studies, leaving no hour unemployed; while at the same time he lost no opportunity of imparting instruction, and cultivating those powers essential to the part in religious society he felt himself marked out for. No opportunity was shrunk from, every chance turned to account. He thus writes to a friend of his first effort in extempore prayer ;—

“No words can convey any idea at all equal to the intense trouble of my inmost soul on that occasion. The family consisted of four men and two female servants, out of whom one only feared the Lord at the time. Conceive my feelings if you can! I am sure I cannot describe them. I was, however, enabled to cry mightily unto the Lord for help, and though my uncle was willing I should make use of a book, and though I was never before engaged in such a service, I was helped to trust the Lord alone. When I first knelt down, I trembled like a leaf from head to foot. I was scarcely able to speak. My head, as it were, turned round, and I knew not where I was. However, I began ; and the Lord began too ; for my heart was enlarged, and I was enabled to go through the exercise with liberty and satisfaction.”—Vol. i. p. 46.

And again he records :—

“The Lord was with me at family prayers this morning, which they made me take. But alas ! I feel so much of abominable pride after it, that the reflection confounds me.”—Vol. i. p. 45.

The importance which this class of characters attach to their work—the position which they realize for themselves—is noticeable : it is, perhaps, the impulse necessary to launch a man into public life. No person, we suspect, can influence numbers, without this acceptance in full consciousness of an important place in the world. It is a feeling wholly independent of mere

position. We know inhabitants of courts and alleys who are possessed by the same sense of relative consequence, making their existence to themselves a public progress. They realize themselves as centres, they act before spectators, and by force of their own impressions—giving distinctness and prominence to their work,—are people of mark in their own world. The essentially private and retiring character, on the other hand, in a sort of dreamy humility not always to be commended, loses its stand from a perhaps cowardly self-desertion. Nothing in which it is concerned is ‘of any consequence.’ Too diffident to talk of humility, with too low an opinion of self to suppose its own self a profitable subject under any mode of treatment, too conscious of failure to try again, it slips out of responsibility and away from the eyes of men, and by necessity from their thoughts also. It is not such as these that write religious diaries—record sensations—denounce themselves and their friends in their journal books as sinners of the deepest dye. They, poor souls, do not feel that their own particular errors are of any consequence to others, and as for writing them down, the deliberate literary act of framing sentences of which self is the hero seems a sort of presumption which cripples the uncertain fingers. Now this is precisely a sort of self-respect that comes naturally to the other. He habitually maintains an inner state: it does not seem at all out of the way to write of himself to himself in rounded periods. None of the conventionalities are allowed to rest; the records are graced with solemn interjections and notes of exclamation such as shrinking timidity only supposes appropriate to printed columns or a crowded auditory. And by this, amongst other means to an end, whether consciously or not, he arms and strengthens himself to hold his own everywhere and under all circumstances.

The subject before us always observed towards himself this state, and was uniformly treated with it. He at once stepped into a position both at college and at home. It is noted as a remarkable fact, we think strongly confirmatory of this view, that people kept his letters: letters they were not, in the common acceptation of the term; all that are shown us are either didactic or exclusively on self, and mainly on his spiritual progress or declension. But people felt at once that they had to do with a public man; if they were not letters they were documents; it would have been disrespect bordering on irreverence to burn them. For instance, here is a letter (written when twenty years old) to his mother (1798). What maternal awe would it not inspire! What was not in store for a son on whom the mission of reproof pressed with such terrible power!

"I am very miserable," he writes to his mother in March, "because my conscience is full of guilt. I have done two things wrong to-day, which are not easily retrieved, and both have arisen from hardness of heart and a sinful fear of man. In the first, I failed of speaking faithfully to a fellow-collegian who is, I fear, deceiving himself; in the second, I have not introduced spiritual discourse in a party where I sat for above an hour at tea. You don't know how heavy these sins lie upon my mind; so that I feel now as unhappy and distressed as possible. May the Lord forgive the 'iniquity of my sin.'"

"Last Sunday week did not pass unnoticed. The recollection of the Lord's mercy did, I hope, in some degree affect my mind, and lead me to renew the dedication of that body and soul to the Lord, which I trust He has 'bought with a price.'"—Vol. i. p. 55.

His companions at St. Edmund's Hall have many of them made a name for themselves. The Rev. Isaac Crouch was vice-principal and tutor, and he had the power of stamping his own views on his pupils, who represent a phalanx of well-known and in most cases respected party names. One of them thus describes Daniel Wilson on his arrival amongst them:—

"Wilson was very good looking, but reserved and somewhat deficient in manner. It was obvious, however, that he was no common person; and though he entered the university under great disadvantages as to classical learning, his extraordinary and determined diligence, aided by robust health, afforded a sufficient pledge of future eminence and success."—Vol. i. p. 53.

We have not many details of his college life. It was not Mr. Wilson's line to draw a character or to relate an incident; he took interest in no one as a mere observer. He was really deeply engrossed with his studies and making up for lost time, and when he took up a pen for any other purpose it naturally slid into inner history and the experiences of the soul. We never know—we defy an intimate friend to know—except by careful reference, whether the extract we are reading is a passage from a private journal, or a letter home, or to a college companion: the style is precisely the same in each case. There is never any intimate personal address; no reference to, or repose in, another mind. Take this specimen of a letter to his mother, the whole of which is in the same strain:—

"The time I spent with you in town appears to me now like a dream that is passed away. Thus it is that our life is hastening along. One scene presents itself and then vanishes: a second follows, and disappears in like manner. Now we are well; anon sickness seizes us. At this moment, everything is prosperous and comfortable; the next, all is dark and miserable.

"From reflecting upon these changes, however, we may learn two important lessons: the one solemn, the other encouraging.

"It is a solemn consideration, that amidst all the fluctuations of life, we are still making rapid advances towards eternity. Every wave, whether placid or turbulent, wafts us nearer to that awful shore. Like a ship

which continues to make its way whatever the passengers on board may be doing, we are perpetually hurried forward, whatever may be our employments.

"But as this is a solemn thought, so it is encouraging to contrast the uncertainty of all things here below with the unchangeableness of our gracious and Almighty Lord. This is our safety, that there is One who hath said, 'Because I live, ye shall live also;' and that there is an unfailing fountain of love and mercy in Him to remedy all the evils of time, and to crown us with every blessing.'—Vol. i. p. 61.

And this from a journal about the same time :—

"*January 5, 1800.*—I would now desire to raise my Ebenezer, and say, 'Hitherto the Lord hath helped me.' I have been kept from sin. Oh! what do I owe to the Lord for his grace. I would desire to lay the whole glory at his feet, and say, 'Not unto me, not unto me!' The means of my preservation has been, the Lord keeping up in my heart a consciousness of my own weakness, and so preserving me from trusting in my own power and might. Thus have I been kept from day to day. But I feel a dread of committing sin. 'Hold thou me up and I shall be safe.'"

"*January 26, 1800.*—How fast the days and weeks creep on! Three weeks have passed since I last wrote, and they seem but a moment. I have much reason for thankfulness, for the Lord's goodness to me. Oh! that I may still have a constant conviction of my own weakness, and a simple reliance upon the power and greatness of Christ. I do hope that I have a true repentance for sin, and that I really long for deliverance from it. But what can I say? Religion is what I have yet to learn. Oh! Lord, to thee would I look. Decide the doubt. I trust I am truly sincere. I hope I do truly wish and pray for deliverance from sin. I believe that there is nothing impossible with thee!"—Vol. i. p. 57.

We are not told how far Daniel Wilson's was a character capable of inspiring strong affection, but it instilled confidence, raised expectation, and acquired weight, especially, we may well suppose, in his family: mothers and sisters so naturally love to be put second to what seems a great design; and submit with pride to the exactions of a sturdy resolution. Thus his sister records how 'he settled his plan' in his first vacation :—

'As soon as he arrived at home, and the first greetings were passed, he appealed to his mother. "Now, my dear mother, I am come to read. I can let nothing interrupt me till two o'clock. Then I shall be ready to enjoy your company and that of my sisters till tea-time, when I must have two or three hours more study before I go to bed."

'All this was acquiesced in by his family, and rigidly adhered to by himself. He was never interrupted. A friend might occasionally be introduced into his little study, but he himself was never called down. And surely the secret of his success in after life is involved in this resolute purpose, resolutely carried out.'—Vol. i. p. 60.

It did not occur to him that home might teach him something; but this was not a nature to learn anything indirectly; he was no subject for subtle influences. All his successes and all his failures were due alike to an insatiable devotion to work: his life from first to last was a series of definite performances

achieved. Through this habit he grew up a man entirely to be depended on for carrying through an undertaking; prompt in business, always prepared, always at his post. As a public man (we can see from these volumes) regarded as the stay of his party; but if he had much private influence we see no trace of it here. He was too busy a man, interruption was too intolerable to him, to know anything of human nature. We cannot read men as we can read books; it is impossible to acquire such knowledge without some intervals of leisure, some margins of unoccupied time; nor without submitting to be sometimes a *learner*; without laying the didactic habit entirely aside and discoursing with men on terms of simple equality, under the impression that the chances of improvement are mutual.

At college Mr. Wilson's industrious habits were at least well-timed; he had lost time to make up and a new sphere to prepare for. Stories of his indefatigable diligence were told long after he had left the university. He took his degree in June, 1801. Nothing was open to him as an object of ambition but the university prizes. Under the advice of Mr. Crouch his tutor, Mr. Pratt, and his friend Mr. Pearson, subsequently Dean of Salisbury, he wrote two years after for the English Essay, the subject of which was 'Common Sense,' and got it, to the great delight, as we may well suppose, of his family, and to the justifiable triumph of the members of his own Hall, who were conscious of being regarded somewhat askance by the university, their literary pretensions being held in little esteem.

'The day following these recitations, one of the Heads of houses met Mr. Crouch in the High Street, Oxford.

"Well, Mr. Crouch," he said, "so 'Common Sense' has come to Edmund Hall at last."

"Yes;" replied Mr. Crouch, with his quiet humour, "but not yet to the other colleges."—Vol. i. pp. 69, 70.

It is remarkable that the 'other recitation' was that of 'Palestine,' by Reginald Heber. Thus the two future bishops of Calcutta succeeded one another in the rostrum. When the time for his ordination drew near, he took up his residence at Chobham, in Surrey, a living held by Mr. Cecil in conjunction with the chapel in Bedford Row, where it was arranged he was to succeed Mr. Pearson as curate, and where for some time the two young men lived in close companionship. Here the great work of preaching occupied his exclusive attention. Mr. Cecil gives him, to start with, a rule or illustration, we cannot tell which, enforcing plainness of speech:—

"Now, then, for the method. Go amongst the poorest and most illiterate of the people where you dwell, and let your subject of discourse to them be the solar system. Endeavour with great plainness to defend

Copernicus against Tycho: and make them thoroughly understand the difference and the superiority. Don't let one depart till he is fully convinced that the sun must be placed in the centre.

"Stop," say you, "I shall never be able to make them understand my very terms." "No? Then invent new ones adapted to their capacity: for much easier is it to give people right notions of the solar system than of the Gospel; and far more willing will they be to let the SUN stand in his place there than here. Pray, therefore, study hard: and in a way a college never teaches."—Vol. i. p. 74.

We are struck with the *pains* enforced by all the acknowledged preachers of this period. We cannot doubt, that, as compositions, their sermons evinced far more skill, and were the result of far more labour than what aims to be popular preaching now, and that they were so far more telling and effectual. We find Daniel Wilson, during this period of preparation, dictating rules for himself; the biographer translates from the Latin in which he wrote at this time:—

"I want suavity. . . I must strive to infuse something of kindness and urbanity into all I do. . . Modesty also is a great thing in a young man.

"*A clear and simple style of writing* must be carefully cultivated; but so, as to avoid everything low and vulgar. That power of expression and flow of imagination which moves and persuades men, is much wanting in me. I must therefore seek by diligence and perseverance to acquire those qualifications which nature has denied. Subjects must be selected for discussion which breathe, love, peace, and goodwill, and which, naturally perhaps, I should be disposed to pass by."—Vol. i. pp. 74, 75.

And again, 'There is danger lest whilst learning from Mr. Cecil, I should copy him too closely.' 'I must be very careful, lest by treading in his steps, I make myself ridiculous.'

"By labouring at a subject, I become too diffuse. It is very well to urge the same thing over and over again in different words, because common people the more readily understand it. But it must not be dwelt on too long. That which does not throw light upon a subject, tends to darken it."—Vol. i. p. 76.

These are his comments on sermons composed before his ordination, which took place September, 1801, when he at once entered on his duties. During his vicar's absence in London he had the exclusive charge of two rural parishes, preached three sermons a week, and visited his parishioners with great assiduity. The two years of his residence at Chobham seem to have been the only period when he systematically visited the poor, or perhaps when he was in circumstances to do so. There, we read—

'He was continually traversing the parish from end to end: every mud hut was visited: and the names of each individual or family at Chobham and Bisley may be found recorded, with traits of character, and slight reports of failure or success in dealing with them; so that at length he obtained from Mr. Cecil himself the name of "The Apostle Wilson."—Vol. i. p. 80.

We have entries of some success in his labours; but after five months of solitary working, Mr. Cecil comes into residence, and gives some faithful advice. He finds his curate using boisterous action and making too much noise. One of Daniel Wilson's especial gifts was a powerful voice, which in his keeping was not likely to be a talent lost. The following passage tells well for both parties—

‘During one of Mr. Cecil’s visits to Chobham, he had endeavoured to correct that loudness of voice and vehemence of action in the pulpit which threatened to become habitual and excessive. This is noticed in Daniel Wilson’s private journal, and his remark is as follows :—

“‘I clearly perceive that my preaching is very bad. It is all *‘vi et armis.’* I make clamour, and shouting, and noise my helpers—as if sound without sense ever did any good. I must spare no pains to correct these faults now I know them. I only grieve most deeply that when Mr. Cecil in the kindest manner mentioned them to me, I perceived a secret sensation of anger, when I ought to have felt nothing but gratitude.”

‘This was his manner through life. The advice given was not always remembered, nor always followed; for the bow, bent for a time, would return to its original bias. But no man ever received it more readily, or acknowledged it more gratefully.’—Vol. i. pp. 83, 84.

At the end of two years he was invited by Mr. Crouch to return to Oxford and be tutor at St. Edmund’s Hall; and while this question was pending he became engaged to his cousin Ann, whose father, Mr. William Wilson, possessed large estates at Worton. It resulted in his accepting the appointment, and, after his marriage, undertaking the curacy, or rather Sunday duty, of Worton, his father-in-law’s country residence.

A chapter is devoted to ‘family life,’ which gives a picture of an amiable wife, and of our subject as a kind husband and father. But the biographer thinks it necessary in candour to say—

‘Daniel Wilson can scarcely be regarded as a domestic man. He was not naturally fond of children, nor as patient with them as some men are. His time was too much occupied, and his mind too much engrossed to enter into their pursuits, though he liked to have them about him at proper times, and then found both pleasure and recreation in their company. He always desired their good, and was ready to promote it at any sacrifice. His feelings were in reality very sensitive: when all went well with them his heart was glad, and when they suffered he suffered with them.’—Vol. i. p. 96.

This only means that the world was his sphere, not the home circle. His wife seems to have been resigned that it should be so. She acquiesced in all the changes which this disposition involved, and in that vast accumulation of occupation which interposes between a clever man of business and his fireside. Some domestic trials are recorded after fourteen years of sunshine. Out of six children three only reached maturity, and of these one was the cause of more lasting sorrow than would

an early death. This was the second son, John, who, after a youth of great promise, fell under the temptations of college life, and finally retired to the Continent, where he died while his father was in India. Men take such trials as these differently. The father in this case merges in the theological teacher, and he finds a certain solace in the fact, that here is a confirmation of the great fundamental doctrine of original sin.

"What a scene of folly, blindness, and perverseness does human nature exhibit! With everything to supply his wants and even gratify his moderate desires, my unhappy son rushes into misery under the name of pleasure, and defies both God and man.

"Such is the dignified, rational, and elevated creature, formed originally after the image of his glorious Creator, and capable of some measure of his felicity!

"The FACT of human depravity who can doubt, who knows his own heart, or sees the fruits of folly in the young around him? I know I have your prayers. I have found it exceedingly hard to bear up under this affliction, which during the last two months has been threatening me—I mean, that I find submission, resignation, hope, patience, active and calm exertion, hard. I find faith, love, repose in God, hard. Indeed, I do not know when I have suffered more from inward temptations of various kinds than during this season."—Vol. i. p. 106.

And again—

"My poor, poor boy, I have sent abroad, as you know. God Almighty, have mercy and bring to Himself the alienated mind of this sinful prodigal. 'WHEN HE CAME TO HIMSELF'—what an expression! So did Newton, and Cecil, and Buchanan in later times; and Augustine and Ambrose in former ages. I believe this visitation is intended, among other lessons, to teach me the fall of man more deeply; the doctrine of special grace; the inefficiency of all means in themselves (the two boys had a precisely similar education); the vanity of creature expectations; the bankruptcy (as Cecil said) of domestic, as well as every other source of human joy; the excellency and consolation of the Gospel as a spring of hope; the value of the Bible, and the promises of heavenly repose."—Vol. i. pp. 106, 107.

From 1804 to 1809 Daniel Wilson resided at St. Edmund's Hall, first as tutor, and finally as vice-principal and sole manager. Under his direction, we are told that the Hall increased in numbers and rose in reputation. As virtual head, he endeavoured to bring about some familiar intercourse with the undergraduates, who were invited with this purpose to his house; but we are not surprised to read that his natural manner frustrated in some measure these good designs, as well as his too direct aim at doing good, which, when obvious, does not answer upon individuals, however it may act on the masses. A man puts himself in a false position who lets his guest see that the invitation rose out of no hope of pleasure or profit from his company, but solely in the desire to confer some spiritual benefit, or perhaps to inflict some public reproof.

'The plan of inviting the undergraduates in small parties to the familiar intercourse of the house and table was also continued by the Vice-Principal. His lady was always present with her gentle courtesy and kindly greeting, and this, with the introduction of the children, helped to break through the formality of these parties. But still they are said to have wanted ease. They were made too much a matter of business and duty. The desire to do good was too obvious to be pleasant; and the family prayers which closed the evening were oftentimes personal and monitory.'—Vol. i. p. 114.

It would seem as if the Vice-Principal had needed some more home lessons on the depravity of human nature, to teach him that young men are not so meekly constituted as to profit by admonitions conveyed in a form so infinitely unpalatable. Still we are told, that though he kept his pupils at a distance, and was punctilious in all observances, they honoured and admired him, and retain him in affectionate remembrance. He had, in fact, the qualities of a head: he fought their battles for them, remonstrated when he thought they had not been fairly used in examination, and took a decided stand, causing, as it is put, 'no small stir' in the university. Thus he laboured in the week. His Sundays were devoted to the two village churches of Upper and Lower Worton: driving over on the Sunday morning in a postchaise, and returning after evening service. There his vigorous earnest sermons, and loud emphatic delivery, caused great excitement in his rustic audience. The churches were crowded. He had a name throughout the neighbourhood; farmers, we are told, followed him from church to church.

'One pious woman, who had no special claims upon her, used to spend the week in going to and fro to hear him. She lived at a distance of eight or nine miles, and not being able to walk more than two or three a day, had her fixed resting-places. On the Thursday she set off; rested and slept twice on the way; reached Worton on the Saturday; heard Mr. Wilson on the Sunday; set out on her return on Monday; and reached home on Wednesday, in time to set out again on Thursday.

"I thank God," said a labouring man, "that I have been able to come the whole distance of seven miles to Worton church for eight years, without missing more than two Sundays."

"But surely the long walk must sadly weary you?"

"Nay," he replied, "the walk appears short and easy, when I have listened to those simple truths of the Gospel which nourish my soul."

'The Word of the Lord was precious in those days!'—Vol. i. pp. 124, 125.

Some recollections of these sermons are given, which hardly account for their wonderful popularity; but no extracts of sermons ever do. It sometimes seems as though the biographer himself were puzzled to know the secret of their great success. But the subtle power of the preacher is incommunicable to paper, and we gather that this was possessed by Daniel Wilson in its fullest force for about only the first twenty years of his ministry.

The French connoisseurs of pulpit oratory pronounce that preachers begin to deteriorate after the age of forty-five; that from that period their mastery over an audience declines. This must show the electric force of energy, which as a human quality suffers abatement under the weight of years, like all other mortal gifts. This energy seems to have been Daniel Wilson's peculiar excellence. What he believed earnestly and felt strongly he could impart with a like earnestness and strength. What is called 'his almost unequalled voice' served him in such good stead that he never seems to have suffered fatigue; on the contrary, the exercise for body, mind, and soul was so congenial (as we suppose the free exercise of a gift or faculty must always be), that while he says—

"My time at Oxford was utterly without profit as to my soul. Pride grew more and more, and carnal appetites enchained me. On the other hand, Worton afforded me much spiritual consolation."—Vol. i. p. 132.

The truth seems to be, that preaching was so much his natural calling, that every place or office which debarred him from it was distasteful and dispiriting. We observe throughout that he uniformly felt in a better and higher spiritual state when he was teaching others; that the opportunity to impart his gifts was indispensable to his happiness; and therefore, to live in Oxford and not to preach in Oxford was to exist in an uncongenial element. In 1811 he was called upon to quit it for a sphere more suited to his talents and temper. The ministry of St. John's Chapel, Bedford Row, was pressed upon him by Mr. Cecil, the incumbent, who found his powers failing, seconded by the principal members of the congregation; and after some negotiation he accepted the offer, and removed with his family to London. This chapel, whose unattractive exterior is preserved in these pages, was built in the reign of Queen Anne by some of the parishioners, who resented her appointment of Dr. Sacheverel to St. Andrew's, Holborn. It was never consecrated, and was pulled down some years since on showing symptoms of insecurity. The interior of the edifice and its extra-parochial, or perhaps anti-parochial, character, seem to have perfectly adapted it for the most effectual display of a popular preacher's powers:—

'Possessing no sort of ecclesiastical character externally, the building was yet in the interior, and previous to an enlargement in 1821, which brought forward the galleries and injured the proportions, a noble and imposing structure; and few recollections of a religious kind are more deeply written on the memories of a generation now passing away, than of the crowded congregations in that interior hanging upon Daniel Wilson's lips, and listening to his commanding oratory and impassioned appeals. There was nothing of affectation in his mode of address, thus to

win popularity, or draw a crowd. He stood as God's minister to do God's work. He was an earnest man, when earnest men were comparatively rare; he fully preached the Gospel, when preachers of the Gospel were comparatively few. Add to this, that he was steadfast when many were given to change, and moderate when many were prone to extremes; and you have the primary causes of his great and ever-increasing influence at St. John's. Others there were. His manner was natural. His voice was perfect. His enunciation was remarkably clear and distinct. His action varied with the subject: now grave, now vehement, but always graceful and appropriate. When through a crowd of standing auditors, he walked up the long side aisle, before the sermon, with features set and full of seriousness, every eye turned towards him with a feeling of interest as to what the Lord God was about to say by his mouth. Those who have known him in the decline of life, or those even who have only known him in Islington, have no idea of his power in the pulpit of St. John's. In the decline of life, peculiarities often crept into his discourses; and in Islington, local and parochial matters upon which he wished to influence men's minds, were frequently introduced; but there was nothing of the kind at St. John's. He was then like a man, "set for the defence of the Gospel." Mr. Simeon used to say that the congregation were at his feet. All felt his power. The preaching of "Christ crucified," and the salvation of the souls of men were his great objects—never forgotten—never out of sight. There was a seriousness in his manner, before which levity shrank abashed; an occasional vehemence, which swept all obstacles before it; a pathos and tenderness, which opened in a moment the fountain of tears; and a command, which silenced for a time the mutterings of unbelief.—Vol. i. pp. 172, 173.

This was probably the happiest period of Mr. Wilson's life, the most unruffled, and where his influence and success were least disputed. In the larger sphere of Islington we gather there was many a clash and hostile encounter, and in his more elevated duties in India it is apparent that a large body of those under his control were never brought under his moral influence. But nobody attended Bedford Row Chapel but from free choice. The congregation accepted the preacher not only as a pastor, but as the able exponent of their own views. With them the sermon was one of the main events of the week. The preacher knew this, and naturally prepared himself to meet the occasion, with the additional stimulus expressed in the following reflection—on the appearance of a new and distinguished hearer—'How important is the situation of a minister in London! He never knows whom he is addressing.' Looking back from India to these times, the old Bishop writes, with doubtless some tender regrets after his former pattern congregation:—

"Let me affectionately remind you, my most truly beloved Deatry, how Mr. Cecil for twenty-eight years, and I for sixteen, got on at St. John's. (1) It was by steady and diligent preparation; (2) hard study; (3) texts chosen on the Sunday night and sermons begun on Monday morning; (4) matter collected from all our great authors during the early days of the week; (5) sermons finished on Friday; (6) Saturdays left for the refreshment of the body by country air; (7) *Saturday night's assurances*

obtained by meditation and prayer on the preparation made for the following day.

“An immense congregation of acute lawyers and busy curious merchants, amounting to nearly two thousand, can only be kept together, as a means under God, by such a course of solid, well-digested food, carefully prepared.”—Vol. ii. pp. 337, 338.

And the biographer writes:—

‘The sermons were often long, but that was deemed no grievance: and as he had no parochial charge, they were made the centre round which other duties revolved. Texts were selected on the Sunday evening or Monday morning, and his thoughts were then concentrated on them for that week. If a brother clergyman was met in the streets, the conversation would turn, not on the current news of the day, but upon last or next Sunday’s sermon:—What the text? What the treatment? What the effect? No labour was deemed too great. He had that peculiarity which characterises every distinguished man—he was painstaking. He was always a student, and delighted in study. The body of the discourse was written in very large shorthand, so as easily to catch his eye, for he was very short-sighted in middle life; whilst the blank side was covered with extracts from critics, commentators, fathers, divines, and devotional writers of all kinds. This involved great labour, and must by no means be confounded with the “short and easy method” of looking at a commentator, adopting his comment, and from it framing the sermon.’—Vol. i. p. 175.

Two facts of different tendencies may be gathered from all this: the one that our parochial system is a hindrance to the perfect development of pulpit oratory, that this may be carried to its finest point of cultivation only where preaching is the paramount work and duty of the pastor, and the main ordinance in the eyes of the congregation; the other, that every one who has to preach may take a lesson from the diligence and zeal here recorded. If people hope to make their sermons useful and effectual they must throw their heart into the work, have faith in it as a mighty and divine engine for good, and bestow the pains which such a conviction exacts from them.

But sermons were by no means Daniel Wilson’s only labours. He threw himself into the business of *societies* with characteristic ardour: into boards, committees—organization of all kinds—all modes of doing good and carrying out undertakings on a system and through mechanism. Whatever makes benevolence to the bodies or the souls of men most like a business, was his especial *forte*. In the summer months he went on deputation tours for the Bible and Church Missionary Societies, and proved his powers of persuasion by winning large sums of money from his hearers. These tours were so many triumphs. Everywhere he met with homage. And he grew to have such faith in himself, such a contempt of ordinary obstacles, that we actually find him preaching a French sermon or address, in

Paris, in which it seems he consistently pronounced *cœur*, *cour*, we are not told with what effect on his audience. Indeed, his life differs most materially from those biographies which relate the revival at the close of the eighteenth century, in that he encountered no persecutions, no slights, no trials. He reaped the fruit of other men's labours. We can only say, that if we have to note some arrogance, some intolerance, some traces of an overbearing temper and will, here is not only the reason, but, as man is constituted, no small excuse also.

Wherever he went Daniel Wilson took the lead. His word was law; all assumption was greeted with a recognition of his rights. He regarded himself, and was regarded, as a choice public instrument, which it was a common duty to preserve unimpeded, clear, and in order, for its main work. He grew impatient of interruption; he had little leisure for individual appeals, and became a great adept at ridding himself of what in serious phraseology would be termed hindrances of usefulness—but in the language of the world are called bores. 'No doubt affection was checked,' Mr. Bateman allows, by this course, but an infinite amount of irksome labour was spared. His admirers, however, were submissive.—

'Of this his old friend, Mr. Basil Woodd, who was fond of a little quiet talk, used to complain. "When I go to see Mr. Wilson," he was wont to say, "before I have well settled myself in the chair and got into conversation, I hear him say, 'Good-bye, dear Basil Woodd, here is your hat, and here is your umbrella.'"—Vol. i. p. 181.

Practice develops our resources. Mr. Wilson's faculties held, as it were, a perpetual sitting committee of self-defence. No bore could take him by surprise, or even, as it seems, drive him to the use of unsanctified weapons. His singular absence of reserve in his habits of personal religion comes out in some of these instances. This was part of himself. Either he had never had the feeling of shyness in making public his profession, or he had quenched it at once as cowardice. He was strict and devout in the observance of private prayer, and delighted also in the exercise of extempore prayer on every public and social occasion, till its language became a second nature, and as such was, we must observe, now and then resorted to as a seeming expedient.—

'A friend (the Rev. Thomas Harding, now vicar of Bexley), accompanied him to Brighton on behalf of one of the religious Societies. Two large meetings had been attended; and the evening having been closed by an address to a circle of friends at Sir Thomas Blomefield's, and by prayer, they entered the coach together on their return to town. There were no other passengers. The moment they had fairly started, Daniel Wilson, drawing up the window, said, "Now, my dear friend, we must have our

evening prayers together ere we sleep." He then in a few outspoken words commended his friend, himself, and those whom they had just left, to the Divine protection: and his petitions ended, he settled himself into his corner, and fell fast asleep.—Vol. i. p. 201.

If he had given way to the exactions of his young admirer and talked and listened, he would have arrived at the end of the drive exhausted. If he had shut himself up in resolute silence, he would have given the impression of evading an obvious occasion of usefulness. A short prayer disposed of both difficulties. He impressed the young man with his master-mind, and secured needed rest, which we do not see could have been gained with so easy a conscience under any other terms. On another occasion, when, at a public meeting, he feared that a resolution contrary to his wishes would be carried, he rose to propose an adjournment for the purpose of further consideration and prayer. He regarded prayer as a good thing and delay as a good thing, and did not hesitate to secure one by the other; though, as it is here put, prayer was resorted to more as an instrument to secure delay than because he felt the need of further Divine illumination. Such anecdotes enforce upon us the persuasion that party leadership and supremacy are really an ill preparation for the episcopate. We mean, that a certain dictatorship is revered and admired where men regard the dictator as their champion, but where no such tie exists, the habits thus acquired of self-reliant, high-handed action, must cause endless irritation, and are likely to establish a permanent want of sympathy on all sides. If the Bishop took the lead at a Calcutta dinner-party as he did at an English one, there would certainly be several present whose taste and nerves would enter an inner protest. It was not the way to gain influence there, though it might be at home.

'An incident of a somewhat similar character occurred at Sir Thomas Fowell Buxton's house in town. A large party of clergy and laity, attracted by the May meetings, had been invited to his hospitable board. All were of one mind, and all desirous of mutual edification, but the evening was passing away and the conversation was still desultory and broken. Suddenly a loud voice was heard from the top of the table addressing one seated near the bottom. It was Daniel Wilson speaking to Dr. Marsh. "William Marsh," he said, "may I ask you a question? You have had some experience in dealing with criminals lying under sentence of execution: is there any one portion of Scripture that you have found more efficacious than another in bringing them to conviction of sin and true repentance? But"—checking himself and referring to Mrs. Fry, who was sitting beside him—"perhaps I ought rather to put the question to my neighbour. May I, dear madam, ask whether any particular passage of Scripture occurs to you as having proved most useful to that class of our fellow-sinners?"—Vol. i. p. 199.

The period from 1810 to 1830 is assigned, amongst other

labours, to his 'literary life.' Daniel Wilson was always a great reader, chiefly of divinity, and that mainly of his own school, but we find occasional mention of the Fathers, and frequent allusion to Hooker and other standard divines. He accumulated two libraries, first in England and then in Calcutta, and spared no expense to furnish himself with works necessary to get up the subject in hand, for he always read with a definite and immediate purpose. Reading was a part of every day's occupation; reviews and newspapers were a necessity with him, and his main literary recreation. His own works are chiefly sermons, charges, and controversial pamphlets, together with prefaces in the form of sanctions to other works. His preface to Butler's 'Analogy' so satisfied his friends, that the Rev. C. Jerram wished for an act of parliament to enforce the exclusive sale of his edition. Of the value of this, and of his other works, we decline to speak. They have been confined to one section of the Church, nor does Mr. Bateman appear to expect for them a wider circulation; indeed, he is alive to an absence of original thought and to a redundancy of style, which seem to imply that they owed their success solely to the established reputation of their author, and could scarcely be expected to add anything to his name, except as another testimony to his activity of mind and indomitable industry.

In spite of a seemingly iron constitution, this life of preaching, meetings, controversies, 'journeyings often' (as the biographer has it), and literary work, proved at one time too much. He had a serious illness, apparently of a nervous character, which at first took him abroad for several months, and on his return incapacitated him, so that for two years—from 1822 to 1824—he had to lay by. His biographer regrets that a long pause in the journal prevents his seeking there for the *cause* of this mysterious dispensation, but he adds, perhaps 'its very silence is suggestive'—implying a large faith, certainly, in this practice.

At this time the living of Islington, which his father-in-law had bought for him some time before, became vacant, and with health scarcely restored Mr. Wilson had to enter upon new duties. Mr. Bateman is never so poetical as when he speaks of Islington. This suburb is to his mind, without any sense of hyperbole or burlesque, a type of Zion. Of Islington, 'it shall be said that this and that man was born there.' Even its errors are touched on with a tenderness which we fear would not be bestowed on its great rival, Belgravia; and when the time of separation came from him to whom it owes its religious fame, eastern imagery is alone equal to the solemnity of the occasion, and—'Islington yielded up *her* vicar.' It throws some light on the estimate

already formed of Daniel Wilson's character, that his friends feared some injudicious display of 'zeal,' as his overbearing tendencies are styled, in his new sphere. Their admonitions are some testimony to his manner of *receiving* advice, which Mr. Bateman says he always did in a good and frank spirit, while candour obliges him to distinguish this virtue from the more serviceable quality of *following* it, which from the strength of Daniel Wilson's own bias and impulses, he considers him to have been constitutionally incapable of doing. His tutor, Mr. Pratt, writes:—

"To throw your whole intellect, by constant and exhausting efforts, into your ministry at Islington, as you have done at St. John's, would bring you quickly to the grave. But that course would be out of place at Islington. Your changed circumstances will require you to render prominent and characteristic in your ministry, those qualities of tenderness and affection which will less exhaust your own spirits in preparation, and be more consolatory to your own soul in the delivery."—Vol. i. pp. 234, 235.

At his entrance on his new charge his labours are thus epitomised:—

'At the time of which we write, the number of inhabitants was about thirty thousand, and there was but one church, and one chapel of ease, for the spiritual necessities of that great multitude. Strong local attachment characterised the people, combined with good sense, kindly feeling, religious principle; and under good guidance they rose at once to duty, and abounded in good works. But all this was marred by occasional outbursts of party spirit, easily provoked, and with difficulty allayed.

'The Rev. Dr. Strahan had been for many years the vicar; and his character entitles him to be spoken of with great respect. He was a fine specimen of the old school of divines—venerable in appearance—courteous in manners—a good scholar—an excellent reader—regular in the discharge of official duties—and a favourite with a large section of his parishioners.

'Under him Islington slept. Under his successor it awoke. And it has never slept since. It has done more perhaps than any other parish, to meet the wants of an increasing population, and has set an example, which might advantageously be followed by the whole country.

'The appointment of Mr. Wilson to the vicarage, naturally caused "great searchings of heart." He was thoroughly well known as a leader among the Evangelical clergy—prompt, fearless, decided, active, uncompromising; and whilst many of his own St. John's people who resided in Islington, and all who loved him for "the truth's sake," greatly rejoiced, there were others who feared the new doctrine, and doubted "whereunto it would grow." These doubts and fears however did not make them forget that they were gentlemen and Churchmen, and they agreed that their new vicar should be received with all possible courtesy and respect. Such conduct had its reward; and many who at first shrunk from the messenger, lived to bless God for the message which he brought.'—Vol. i. pp. 232, 233.

The truth is, all parishes like a popular or distinguished head, and on Daniel Wilson's side the feeling of ownership would stimulate all the best qualities of head and heart; and for a time at least, keep natural imperiousness in check. Realizing, as he always did, to the full the temporal consequence of his

position, he rejoices in the 'immensely wide sphere of Islington,' and its 'unbounded opportunities of usefulness, as a grace that overwhelms his mind.' Thus impressed, common sense and good feeling together suggested a conciliatory course. He laid himself out to allay prejudice, to disarm opposition. He took trouble, he visited those parishioners from whom he had reason to expect objections; he was careful not to give offence in his sermons, so much so, that he was called to account by old hearers.

'He knew the congregation before whom he was called to minister; and recognised his new position. Before long, however, some persons began to wonder at what they deemed a sacrifice of principle. He seemed to restrain himself in the pulpit. His appeals seemed to be less fervent, and his manner less earnest. They said "he was very different at St. John's." They almost doubted if he preached the Gospel. But this was "their foolishness." The sermons were the same. They were St. John's sermons wisely adapted to Islington: and the course pursued was the one most likely to produce the desired effect—"if by any means I may save some." He was gently remonstrated with by a well-wisher, and his reasons were asked. The answer was immediate, and to this effect:—"I could preach away the parish church congregation in a fortnight; and in another fortnight, perhaps, I could fill it with a congregation twice as large. But these are my parishioners. I do not wish to drive them away. I long for their souls as one that must give account. My heart's desire is to lead them to Christ. The branch in the vine must not be cut off, but made fruitful."—Vol. i. p. 238.

The effect of this course, we are assured, was in the highest degree satisfactory, 'Religion became prominent, and worldliness drew back complaining and murmuring: "There is no such thing as getting a comfortable game at cards now, as in Dr. Strahan's time." A telling sentence in more than one way. For this *prominence* is precisely the word for the excitement and bustle of religious intercourse, which in so many places superseded the old-fashioned resources of society. Perhaps 'worldliness' need not have drawn back in so discontented a spirit. Wherever men gather together, wherever disposition and character have room for play, there this penetrating influence will find its exercise. But on the subject of amusement, Daniel Wilson accepted, probably without a moment's question or investigation, the dictum of his party. Cards were, as such, intrinsically evil. No motive, no moderation in the use of them, could mitigate their innate depravity. They were a badge, part of the world's livery. And so of every other form of popular recreation. Probably he never himself experienced the want of amusement; his faculties had always their full and most congenial play; and he did not understand why others should need what he did not. He could not see that youth or obscurity, or a life of heavy or uncongenial occupation, or certain genial powers, to be

developed in no other way, should possibly demand some latitude of judgment on this point. These teachers' idea of social recreation is necessarily themselves taking a lead in a way to quench the inventive powers of others. At least, if they do not recognise this duty it is so much the more unfair, for while they stop one source of diversion, they take no trouble to provide a substitute. In the glimpses of society as it should be, given in this and similar works, we observe that every social gathering is necessarily of two distinct classes, imparters and recipients, actors and sufferers. Those who instruct, direct, relate, expound, pray, are in fact in full exercise of gifts which, if they possess them, or think they possess them, it is pleasant and exciting to use: and others, whose passive part is to imbibe the instruction, to submit to the direction, to be amused by the relation, edified by the expounding, and borne along by the prayer. Now enthusiasm, or respect, or the stimulus of a new interest, may reconcile persons for a time to this subordinate position, but only for a time. It needs no personal familiarity with this phase of society to feel certain, that the lively, and active-minded, will grow dissatisfied with having nothing to do, and find amusements for themselves bearing some strong affinity in their elements to the ordinary forms of popular diversion; while the duller or more timid spirits, will become stiff, formal, and lifeless, under the passive burden imposed on them; content to sit in submissive rows at tea parties, and to swell the crowd of undiscerning listeners at Exeter Hall. But this is mere generalizing, we know little of Islington past or present beyond what this book tells us, and from it we learn, that wherever Daniel Wilson went, he would certainly bring an atmosphere of excitement and (where no controversial bitterness was raised) genial bustle with him. Religion was his business in every sense, and he was able to impart the interest of business to it.

His first effort was to procure the building of three new churches, an important and difficult undertaking successfully carried through. The parish schools were out of the clergy's hands, and the managers seem to have been jealous of their rights; but all the organization of a parish was diligently carried out, Sunday Schools, Visiting Societies, and the like. A general air of work seems to have been diffused, the vicar presiding in the vestry or his library as the central figure. With him no privilege was allowed to lie idle. He found in his church a lecturer appointed by the parish; after a long struggle, he established an exclusive right in his own church. It was a life that suited him, his services were a happiness, he records 'blessed Sabbaths,' he relates how he 'preached with great delight' to 'crowded churches, and great attention.'

'Delightful meetings,' and 'charming meetings,' occupy many of his days. Every hour was engaged; everywhere he had, or seemed to himself to have, success. But in the midst of these busy scenes a trial came. After much patient and protracted suffering, his wife died, the 10th of May, 1827; a loss which the biographer calls the heaviest trial of his life. The dissolution of a happy union of twenty-four years must indeed be a heavy trial; but no domestic bereavement, though felt at the time, and tenderly dwelt on in the memory, could in this case affect the whole man. He was so essentially a public man, that the impetus of a career carried him beyond the circle of private ills; and we read:—

'Mr. Wilson was not prostrated by the stroke, as some men would have been. His heart was sad, but duty called, and he at once obeyed; and thus his mind recovered rapidly its accustomed tone. The Confirmation had been going on in his parish, and more than seven hundred young persons had renewed the vows of their Baptism on that occasion; and it was now his anxious concern to prepare them for the full communion of the Church in the Lord's Supper. He preached a sermon on the subject, and invited them to come to him for previous instruction. They responded to his invitation, and came in large numbers. Writing to a friend on June 9th, he says:—

"I have been very busy this week. The young people have come in quite as fast as I could expect, considering the solemnity of the engagement, and the difficulty young persons feel at coming to a minister. We have had about one hundred and eighty; which will soon be increased, no doubt, to about three hundred before the Communion days. There is a great impression on all minds. Most of those who come to me are in tears, and a spirit of inquiry is diffused throughout the parish."

'After preaching before the Judges at Oxford, on July 26th, he retired into the country for rest; and his house was given up into the hands of the workmen. Ever since his accession to the living he had been endeavouring to arrange for the purchase or erection of a suitable vicarage, but without success. He now abandoned the idea, and contented himself with enlarging his present house, and adding to it a magnificent library thirty-five feet long, twelve feet wide, and sixteen feet high. When finished, this library was his delight. Ten thousand volumes covered the walls in double rows, and he sat in the midst, presenting a striking contrast to the time when he shared one little room with a brother curate, at Chobham, and had a few books scattered on the floor below and the bed above. The picture of him as seated in this library will be familiar to surviving friends. They will remember the few winding stairs leading downwards, and affording the first glance of him, seated at the table by the fire-side, immersed in papers, and "diligent in business." They will recall the hand, writing till the very last moment, the uplifted face, the troubled look brightening into a smile, the hasty rise, the kindly greeting, the chair turned round, the fire stirred, and the pleasant converse at once begun; or else the face retaining still its impression of thought, the mind refusing to relax and throw off its occupation, the standing welcome, the pen retained, the excuse pleaded, the business hurried over or postponed, the not unwilling farewell, and the chair resumed before the baffled visitor had closed the door.'—Vol. i. pp. 262, 263.

We have not space for the details and difficulties of his parish

life, which altogether was not a long one; for now another sphere dawned upon him. But before opening on this new career one entry arrests our attention, showing the light in which his private diary is regarded by his biographer and his friends: one we think which will throw more difficulties than ever in the way of executing such a record with simplicity, as between God and the soul. For twenty-three years Daniel Wilson discontinued his journal: in 1830, he resumed it, and Mr. Bateman makes several extracts of confession and self-humiliation; at the conclusion of which, we read:—

‘We have thus been enabled to look within the veil; and to contrast the outer and the inner life of the believer. The first is like the tabernacle of old, wherein the daily sacrifice was offered, and all things necessary for accomplishing the service of God performed; but the second is like the holy place, wherein is the mercy-seat, and the sweet incense, and the silent adoration, and the solitary worshipper with his hands upon the horns of the altar, confessing his own sins and the sins of his people.’—Vol. i. p. 276.

Thus, words of self-abasement, accusations which seem to aim at lowering the writer in the eyes of the reader, whoever that reader may be, have a directly contrary effect. The biographer calls it looking within the veil. We are admitted into a sanctum. He regards it, in fact, as nothing more than an enlightened theological statement on the inherent corruption of human nature. The only way to avoid this, if other eyes are ever to rest upon the document, is to particularize, give *instances* of the pride and other sins in the various humbling forms through which they have assaulted us. Sin—the sin of which we are ashamed—sin painted in plain colours, is always contemptible. People would think the worse of us if they knew some things about us. We should not cut the same figure in their eyes, we could never recover our dignity. We should pass amongst our neighbours as the man who had indulged in such a mean train of thought, followed such a vile impulse, fallen under such a low temptation. It would never do. Men are not recipients for such confessions; or only under very peculiar circumstances. They must be poured into the ears of Infinite Wisdom, Purity, and Compassion. But, this being so, all these vague general confessions answer no legitimate purpose. A man cannot, and need not, make himself vile in the eyes of his fellow-creatures; yet naked sin is a vile or contemptible thing; very different in its effects on our apprehension from its aspect when defined in a strictly theological formula, where the very ambiguity of the terms lends a cloak of respectability. We are not judging what strength of contrition the writer may have felt; we ask now what meaning the reader attaches to the following lines:—

"June 23d.—I have never felt more deeply the misery of my soul. My efforts to conquer evil passions seem in vain. I find myself the servant of sin and Satan, and the enemy of God. My imaginations, thoughts, desires, affections, conscience,—all are corrupt and enfeebled. Alas! my God, I prostrate myself before Thee. I confess my wretchedness. I pray for help. I want a true change of heart, a true love to God in Christ Jesus. My heart condemns me. Ah! Adorable Saviour, give me grace to turn from sin, and follow Thee as my Master, my Saviour, and my God."'
—Vol. i. p. 273.

All depends on the actual privacy of such records. If the writer here believed that no eye would see the words but his own, it is one thing; but if he anticipated any further use being made of them, if he thought he was writing for the good of others, perfect simplicity of expression was absolutely impossible. He might not know this, but every candid and thoughtful reader must acquiesce when it is put before him. Suppose any writer of the party Bishop Wilson so strongly opposed were to argue anything from these confessions—suppose he were to disparage him from his own words, say 'he was "worldly," "jealous," "uncharitable," "covetous," "car-nal," "full of evil thoughts," he says so himself, his journal is 'full of it'—what would Mr. Bateman say? what the *Record*? But if this is felt, as it truly is, an unjust and ungenerous use to make of pious self-accusations, what purpose does their publication answer, unless it be to teach others what to say in their diaries; a very questionable knowledge, which would result in a form of religious composition for posthumous publication never expected to be believed by the writer, and never intended to be believed in any practical sense by the biographer.

An ardent, zealous spirit of another school once adopted the system of private written confession, which his friends thought it for the good of the Church to publish after his death. This diary has been sneeringly alluded to by an able journalist in connexion and comparison with that of Bishop Wilson. Perhaps it is no reproach to the world that it 'laughed' at some of these confessions, because we maintain that sin is not only wicked but ludicrous, especially in its more venial manifestations. No one knew this better than the penitent, who had the keenest powers of satire. He chose to show up his weakness to himself in that spirit of 'revenge' which is an apostolic mark of genuine repentance; he would have accepted the 'laughter' as a fit and merited penance, in the same spirit. He neither wished himself or others to think better of him than he deserved. Such entries, then, are in the right spirit of religious, penitential journal-keeping; whether fit for publication is indeed another matter, and open to question by those who recall that.

noble physiognomy, which once to see was never to forget; that clear glance, and keen, ethereal air,—the vigorous spirit glowing through a mortal attenuation,—the bright intelligence, the animating presence, the sweet boyish enthusiasm forgetting self, and pain, and weakness, in zeal for a cause. But an old remembrance, a picture of the past, has carried us a long way from Daniel Wilson.

We are now brought to the most important step of his life, resulting in his appointment to the see of India. On the appointment, in 1829, of Bishop Turner (fourth bishop), his attention had been much engaged with the subject of missionary bishops, and he had even been consulted by Dr. Turner on the duties of the office. On occasion of Dr. Turner's unexpected death, in 1831, he immediately busied himself, through his friend then in office, Charles Grant, to secure a fit successor, 'pleading for the appointment of a man (1) of thorough and decided piety, (2) of good talents, (3) of amiable temper, (4) of some station in the Church.' The bishopric was accordingly offered to Dr. Dealtry, to Chancellor Raikes, and Archdeacon Hoare, who successively declined it. It may be wondered why, on this order of choice, the offer was not made spontaneously to Daniel Wilson. We think it must have been but for some doubt of his fitness on personal grounds, founded, if we might guess, on manner. However, this must be mere conjecture; the facts are thus stated. On the refusal of the three already mentioned,—

'This made him fear lest the appointment should fall into inferior hands. He communicated these apprehensions to Mr. Grant, through Dr. Dealtry, and named, at their request, many persons whom he deemed highly eligible. Having done this, the thought, he says, came into his mind as expressed in the prophet's words, "Here am I, send me;" and he wrote again to state, that if a real emergency arose, and no one else could be found, *he was ready to go*. The account of all that followed when that step was taken, is found in a short-hand manuscript, written from day to day, by himself; and from it what follows is extracted. It shows at once the course of events and the workings of his own mind; and if there appears anything of eagerness or anxiety respecting the appointment, let it be remembered and strongly borne in mind that he was desiring what many others would not have, and that it was not a prize he sought, but a sacrifice he contemplated. His words are, "I was compelled by conscience and by an indescribable desire, to sacrifice myself, if God should accept the offering, and the emergency arise." India was still accounted of at that time as a place of banishment from home and friends. No overland route, no Suez railway, no electric telegraph, abridged the intervening space, or alleviated the pain of separation. And as to the Bishopric, a peculiar fatality seemed to have settled on it. Four bishops, prostrated by their overwhelming duties, or the uncongenial climate, had sunk and died within nine years; and he who followed them must go, "baptized for the dead." And what was the appointment, speaking after the manner of men, to one in the position of Mr. Wilson? He was fifty-four years old; he had a full competency; he was happily situated; he filled a high post;

he discharged important duties; he was surrounded by loving friends; he exercised a wide influence:—what could the East hold out as a compensation to the man who resigned all these? Mr. Crouch, his old tutor, who still survived, wrote to him from the quiet parsonage of Narborough, when the appointment was complete, and expressed what every one who reflected must have felt:—"From the intelligence communicated by the newspapers, I had been led to concur with the united wish of the religious public, that your health might be found equal to your very important duties. The sacrifice you are making of comfort and enjoyment in your native country is disinterested and magnanimous; and to use language which has been applied on a similar occasion, I bow myself before such heroic virtue; or rather, I adore the grace of God in Christ Jesus, which is able to raise up such instances of it in our degenerate days."—Vol. i. pp. 279, 280.

No one would attribute the more worldly or vulgar motives for desiring preferment to Daniel Wilson. He wished to be Bishop of Calcutta because he wished to do good, and with the full intention of devoting heart and soul to the work. Nevertheless, the unusual step by which he secured his elevation is a remarkable instance of profound self-reliance and self-estimation. He had perfect confidence in his own powers, he felt that he possessed the art of government, that he held to a hair the golden mean, that things would certainly go wrong if he did not direct them; and he felt also strong within him the *instinct of rising*—a feeling which mingled insensibly with all the others, and makes it very unreal talk in his friends at the time, in his biographer *now*, in himself, in his journal, to talk of *sacrifice*. It was a sacrifice in no other sense than promotion to a post of honour, accompanied with some danger, is a sacrifice, in every profession, as involving some loss and some regrets. Indeed, he does not always feel it such, for he writes with feeling and candour during the period of suspense:—

"Jan. 12th.—I have heard nothing. I have been particularly agitated and stricken in spirit through the night and through this day. I cannot account for this anxiety. It is neither reasonable nor Christian, but weak and disqualifying. I fear it is the effect of pride, vanity, and self-consideration. Oh Lord, undertake for me. May I have no will but Thine. May I wait the declaration of Thy will with patience. May I be willing to know nothing till Thou declarest Thy pleasure."—Vol. i. p. 281.

Another difficulty harassed him. He felt the awkwardness, so to say, of his position with regard to the very valuable living of Islington. Giving up power and influence was not to be thought of. He would hardly accept the bishopric, if by so doing he gave the next presentation to Government. But to keep both subjected him to misconstruction. However, it ended, as it would be sure to end in his case, 'in the common-sense view.' He was never really harassed by scruples, and would unquestionably believe that he did emphatically the best

in presenting the living to his son, in whom he could confide for carrying out his plans.

'When his mind was thus made up, all anxiety about what he calls his "dear, dear parish," ceased.'—Vol. i. p. 283.

He had an interview with Mr. Grant, thus noticed:—

'On the one side was manifested a sense of the deep responsibility incurred in making the appointment, an earnest desire to choose one whose faithfulness to the truth was unquestionable, a very kind recollection of early scenes and other days; mingled with some apprehensions, lest the prompt and impulsive action so characteristic of the man of his choice should lead to difficulties amongst a fastidious Christian community, and a sensitive native population. Whilst on the other side, there appeared an entire disinterestedness, a readiness to withdraw in a moment all pretensions if it was deemed expedient, a determination to watch against natural tendencies, to act cautiously, to take time, and to use in a new position the experience gained by many years, and amidst many difficulties; combined with an independence of tone, an assertion of the supremacy of conscience, and a resolution to go unpledged as to all vital matters.'—Vol. i. pp. 284, 285.

He was consecrated on the 29th April, 1832.

'Accompanied by his children, his chaplain, and his early friends the Dean of Salisbury and Mrs. Pearson, he drove to Lambeth, where the ceremony was to take place. On his arrival a procession was at once formed, and proceeded to the private chapel of the Palace. A few chosen friends, with Mr. Charles Grant, the officials and the household, alone were present. An admirable and affecting sermon was preached by Dr. Dealtry.'—Vol. i. p. 289.

And now followed a series of engagements.

'His mornings were given to friends, and his days to business. He almost kept open house. At each breakfast hour large parties met for social converse, mutual edification, and kindly farewells. Near relatives, old friends, his late parishioners, distinguished and honoured individuals, were then assembled, and it was reckoned that during the last three months of his stay in England, more than five hundred guests were thus entertained. To one of these parties he himself especially refers, as follows:—

"June 1st.—I have had a most pleasing party to breakfast. Joseph John Gurney, Mrs. Fry, Mr. and Mrs. Buxton, Mr. and Mrs. Hoare, Joseph Wilson of Clapham, &c., about twenty altogether. After reading the forty-fifth Psalm and praying, Mrs. Fry made a prayer; and before breakfast, during the pause, Mr. Gurney made a prayer, and again after breakfast. There was a most pleasing spirit of love, and kindness. Mr. Gurney prayed for me that I might be kept humble, contrite, self-abased, lowly in heart."—Vol. i. pp. 289, 290.

It is noticed that Bishop Wilson's manner was immediately influenced by his elevation. With all this must eventually be so. It was characteristic in this case that the effect should be instantaneous.

'In truth, ever since his elevation, his addresses had been marked by self-possession, fluency, point, and dignity: proving that one ingredient necessary for making a good speaker and a good speech, is the certainty of being listened to with interest and attention.'—Vol. i. p. 291.

He embarked on the 19th of June, accompanied by the biographer, Mr. Josiah Bateman, his nephew and chaplain; and his daughter, who shortly after their arrival in India became Mrs. Bateman. Then follows the history of the voyage, which, succeeding to so much bodily and mental excitement, seems to have tried the Bishop's patience to the utmost. He preached and he read, but the time hung heavily notwithstanding, and the captain was incessantly assailed with questions as to the vessel's progress. His feelings are more simply described than we often find them, in one part of a letter to the Dean of Salisbury:—

“The sea-sickness was a mere trifle; in one week we had overcome it. But the real pressure upon the mind and body, is separation, the severing of all bonds of nature and habit, desolation of heart, the feeling of being alone and imprisoned on the wild barren boundless ocean, without the possibility of escape; no change, no external world, no news, no communication. Then, the difference of diet, bad water, bad butter, bad tea, a rolling cot by night, and an uneasy ship by day—the head confined, the heart withered, the capacity of thought and prayer lost! These constitute the privations of a five or six months' voyage, undertaken for the first time in the fifty-fourth year of a minister's age, and after all his habits and associations have been buttressed and propped up by parish committees, public duties, a circle of brethren, and the endearments of a family.”—Vol. i. pp. 299, 300.

He was embarrassed, too, by a sense of his responsibility, in keeping order amongst the passengers, which his previous life of dictation would render a strong one. The immemorial rubber, the resource of many a long, weary, listless hour, vexed his spirit. He had to be assured that he was not answerable for the introduction of cards, and even was brought so far to a sense of sympathy as to say, that if allowable anywhere, they might be on board a ship. He felt keenly the loss of his own familiar recreations:—

“What a distance am I from all I love! On what a wide waste ocean am I tost! How desolate to the heart, how monotonous, how wearisome, what a void! No friend, no news, no committees, no calls, no magazines, no clerical meetings! Bad bread, bad tea, bad milk, worse butter, worst water; head aching, stomach half sick, bones sore, ship tossing, pitching, lurching; days wearisome, nights disturbed, sabbaths stormy, means of grace full of distraction, the whole body and soul unnerved:—and yet, always rejoicing in the calling of God, delighting in the Bible, hovering from promise to promise, like a bird from spray to spray (as Cecil—dear name!—would say), looking off from the waves, to Him who rules them.”—Vol. i. pp. 308, 309.

On the 5th of November, 1832, he landed at Calcutta, and entered on the duties of his office. We have lingered so long on those scenes and circumstances that formed the man, that it is not possible to do more than touch on the history of his episcopate, which extended through the unusual period of twenty-six years, and occupies nearly three-quarters of Mr.

Bateman's voluminous work. He has adopted the plan of dividing the Bishop's life in India into Visitations. Seven Visitations, through such a vast sphere of labour, and in such a climate, implies in itself a life of great and continuous exertion. A good many indirect statements and allusions seem to imply that the Bishop derived more satisfaction, and felt himself doing more in his visitations than in Calcutta. There he was often thwarted in public proceedings. Macaulay, for instance, withstood him with 'his torrent of words,' and we are left to infer that certain personal peculiarities stood in the way of his 'getting on' in society, though this is nowhere stated. But there are complaints of the impossibility of pleasing the people in Calcutta. 'Bishop Heber had been blamed for neglecting etiquette, Bishop Wilson was blamed for observing it.' The truth seems to be, that he wanted the qualities which recommend a man to general society. He was absolutely without those retiring graces which make men fit in to all scenes. There was a necessity in him to be always prominent, always leading, always promoting his own individual ends. Very good ends they might be, but it threw an impression of fuss and pretension around him. He had been too long master of his company to consider the habits and feelings of others. It is not unlikely, that panting under an enervating climate, his chaplain may have suffered from this exuberance; for he says, with some touch of experience in his tone,—

'He was, in truth, thoroughly a man of business. His heart was in his work. It engrossed even his morning ride and evening drive. When others, weary with a sleepless night or breathless day, sought the early bracing air or cool evening breeze, and felt totally unfit for business, he seemed fit for nothing else, and to like nothing half so well. Join him—and the business of yesterday, the plans of to-day, the projects for to-morrow, were instantly brought upon the tapis; and matters discussed already many times, were discussed at full length once more. It was thus he developed his ideas and fixed his purposes. His mind was cleared and made up, not so much by thought, as by conversation. The repetition caused him no weariness. Business was his recreation and delight.'—Vol. i. p. 326.

He was liberal in every way, profuse and munificent in his benefactions, and handsome in his style of living; gave large dinner-parties—which brought upon him, indeed, a reproof for worldliness from a zealous lady, who represented to him the superior spirituality of teas—and in every way did his utmost to advance the temporal dignity of the see. After describing his house and equipages—

'All the means were provided for entering into society, and reciprocating its courtesies. He accepted invitations, and gave parties. He always reserved to himself the privilege of retiring very early; but whilst

in company he was cheerful and friendly, and his hearty laugh often ran like electricity around the table. In common conversation he could not be said to excel. Of the small coin which passes current in society he had not much, and hence the measures, more or less important, with which his mind was full, became the topics of his discourse. The names of the helpers or the hinderers almost necessarily followed; and things were often said which had better have been left unsaid. In all this he was like a man without guile. Out of the fulness of the heart the mouth spoke; and he found, as many do, that repentance was easier than amendment.—Vol. i. p. 324.

No right or privilege was ever allowed to slumber with him. Whatever he might have thought of bishops before, he realized the importance of the office now. He soon tried his strength with the Company's chaplains, who were not much used to Episcopal interference, and in main things he carried his point. He fell foul even his of own favourite society, the Church Missionary Society, which then, as now, evinced a remarkable jealousy of the Episcopal office, and maintained a controversy with them for three years, drawing such adjurations from the Management as—

“For God's sake, and for the sake of the poor heathens, do not let your love of the Church obstruct the diffusion of Christianity,” wrote Mr. Fowell Buxton from England.—Vol. ii. p. 16.

During this time the Propagation Society enjoyed his greater confidence, and received the following testimony:—

“*August 24th.*—A letter from the ‘Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge’ overwhelms me with gratitude to God. The Society votes me a third 500*l.* to give away, and 500*l.* a year in books for two years; besides a variety of other grants. The kindness with which they treat me is extraordinary. I see in this a talent committed to me of a high order. So also the ‘Propagation Society.’ Oh! for grace to employ, and occupy with these trusts.”—Vol. ii. p. 40.

The vista of work on entering on his new sphere had raised Daniel Wilson's spirits to the utmost. ‘I am daily more and more delighted with my work,’ he writes, and exults in the ‘immense prospects of usefulness,’ in the ‘amazing opportunities of extensive usefulness,’ and in the ‘work immensely important.’ And work he did with all his heart, and not without fruit, as churches and institutions show. But business habits of the most unwearying force, all the mechanism of work, those active supports to faith which busy men lean upon and live by, seem powerless before the huge barrier of Hindooism; and except that habits of industry and perseverance have in themselves a sustaining and encouraging power, and, by supplying constant occupation, do not leave time for regrets and sad retrospection, we should have looked in the course of these pages for some touch of

disappointment. Certainly, in prospect, he expected a larger harvest, and felt missions his especial work. Difficulties did not alarm him; he scarcely realized them, as is seen in his treatment of the caste question. His nature was sanguine. He writes with enthusiasm where there is any token of success from his endeavours. In his primary Visitation, after preaching through an interpreter to a native congregation in the neighbourhood, he writes:—

“Never,” says the Bishop, recalling this day, “had I such grace given me since I have been in Orders, now thirty-four years, as is now vouchsafed; that I, who am indeed ‘less than the least of all saints,’ should be permitted to preach amongst the Gentiles ‘the unsearchable riches of Christ.’ If God carries me through this series of duties and labours, I may say truly, ‘Lord, now lettest thou thy servant depart in peace, for mine eyes have seen thy salvation.’ One such day as we have just passed, is worth years of common service. I really almost wish I might resign Calcutta, and take the See of Madras. These Native Churches require just the care I should delight to give.”—Vol. i. p. 477.

And his friends formed for him the same high hopes; for we find, in a letter to Mr. Cunningham, of Harrow, the following remonstrance, after he had been six years Bishop, and had had time to qualify his own expectations:—

“There are few things I am more afraid of than being made a sort of stalking-horse for evangelical battles. The idea, that because I hold such and such doctrines, and entertain such and such sentiments, and was brought up in such a circle of interior and devoted friends, *all India is, of course, to be converted*, cannot but be hateful to the Lord, who loveth only the contrite in heart, and ‘scattereth the proud in the imagination of their hearts.’ But all is finding its level. The bloom of novelty is blown off. I am forced to stand the same steady, unbending Churchman now, that I had done for thirty-five years at home. I am forced to adopt the general principles of Church Order in my particular province, with fearless superiority to the momentary prejudices of friends or of opponents. Of course, this is not popular, as it was never intended to be; for, ‘if I please men, I am not the servant of Christ.’ But it awaits the last great day.”—Vol. ii. p. 197.

But if so, the feeling only threw him with more energy on the work he could do. He ‘grew more and more convinced of the ‘immense importance of visitations, as awakening the diocese, ‘the clergy, and their flocks.’ At the close of each we read such summaries as the following:—

“Jehovah Jireh!” he says, “The Lord will provide! Surely goodness and mercy have followed me all through this Visitation. Kind friends have appeared at every station, thirty-five sermons have been delivered, Borneo has for the first time been reached by a Bishop, five thousand one hundred miles have been traversed, my own health with Archdeacon and Mrs. Pratt’s preserved, the clergy stirred up, love peace truth zeal promoted, the Church upheld, ten Confirmations administered, three

churches and cemeteries consecrated, congregations of three thousand two hundred people addressed, and one hundred and fifty letters written."—Vol. ii. p. 332.

He preached incessantly, with increasing length and unabated energy, and the thought of these sermons, their force and their number, soothed his latest years. We find him at the close of 1856 writing—

"Spared to the age of seventy-eight; twenty-five years' residence in India; five thousand seven hundred and sixty-five sermons preached from 1801, and two thousand two hundred and twenty-three of them in India."—Vol. ii. p. 386.

The conversion of India is in God's hands, and waits His good time. It is not for us to find reasons why earnest and zealous exertions fail; but we may still say, that a life of controversy and party strife is an ill preparation for the work of evangelizing the heathen. Daniel Wilson in India was too full of the contentions that were going on at home, too full of communication with Islington as to the best way of carrying on the war with 'Tractarianism,' for his heart and soul to be with the natives of his Diocese, either heathen or convert. Mr. Bateman professes to avoid controversy, to keep clear of questions which will involve differences of opinion in his readers where this is possible; but the great movement which began to stir the Church some thirty or forty years ago cannot be ignored. There are continual allusions to it, and some facts are allowed to transpire which throw a strong light on the Bishop's character. We have mentioned his first high approbation of the Propagation Society: the time came for a difference of opinion. It concerned the management of Bishop's College. It should be noted that while there might be some differences of opinion (not here alluded to) between the Bishop and Dr. Mill, whom he found at the head of the College, his learning and personal character are uniformly spoken of with great respect. He left India in 1837, and was succeeded in the Principalship by Dr. Kay. Not long after this, on Professor Malan's retirement, the Society appointed Mr. Street in his place, whom the Bishop thus describes:—

"Professor Street is about thirty years of age, ripe scholar, iron constitution, fine health, active, enterprising, zealous for missions, prodigal of his strength, rides twenty miles of a morning in the sun, manners good, no great talker: in short, he would have been a capital professor, if he had not been imbued for seven years—steeped—in Tractarianism."—Vol. ii. p. 185.

We are not told any particulars of the new professor's teaching. It was not, at any rate, inconsistent with dying in the communion of the Church of England in full and sole trust

in the merits of his Redeemer, and in perfect charity with all men. What we are concerned with is the *mode* by which the Bishop sought to release himself from a difficulty: which was by privately requesting the Propagation Society to withdraw their professor without requiring any specific charge. He had found 'the movement' spreading in India, certain (to him) objectionable views holding their ground in spite of charges and sermons; and it seemed to him a more just and natural proceeding than we can at all regard it, to remove Mr. Street by an act of irresponsible authority.

'This warning [that is, a sermon in which he had announced his intention of putting certain tests to all candidates for holy orders] having failed to produce the desired effect in India, a strong remonstrance was written home; and it was recommended that the Society, without casting any slur upon their Professor, or in any way injuring his prospects, should withdraw him from the College. In earlier days this remonstrance would have produced the desired effect; and the recal of the Professor (for which there was a precedent) would have restored harmony. But, instead of this, a measure of compromise was resolved on. The Bishop was informed, in courteous terms, that the Society was sensible of its obligations to him, and convinced of the impossibility of working the College effectively so long as there was a want of confidence in the mind of the Diocesan. When, therefore, he pronounced any decision condemnatory of the Professor's conduct or doctrine, they should be prepared to meet it by a corresponding resolution on their part. They hoped, however, that such an alteration would take place as would render any further steps unnecessary.

'This was throwing upon the Bishop a responsibility he did not choose to take. To recommend, as Visitor of a College, the withdrawal of a professor, was a very different thing from condemning, as Bishop of a diocese, the conduct and doctrine of a presbyter. In his official character, as Visitor, he had remonstrated with the Society, and recommended a certain course; but, since they did not think proper to adopt it, he felt freed from all responsibility. His conscience was relieved; and though he grieved daily over what he saw, yet he took no further steps till called upon to confirm, in person, some years after, what he had affirmed in his official letters at this time.'—Vol. ii. pp. 186, 187.

The last words are in allusion to the public attack on the Society the Bishop thought well to make on his only visit to England in 1845, on occasion of his health giving way. In connexion with these heart-burnings and harsh proceedings our readers will, we are sure, thank us for the welcome contrast afforded by the following affecting details of Professor Street's death, in 1851, in part from the Bishop's pen. After the mention of his illness, reported by Dr. Kay, he writes:—

'*April 24th.*—I truly rejoice to say that Professor Street is better. He said to a young Catechist yesterday, 'Be of good courage; go up, and possess the land in the length of it, and in the breadth of it.' And to Dr. Kay, who asked him if he felt peace, 'Whom have I in heaven but Thee, and there is none upon earth I desire in comparison of Thee.' There is, however, fever still, and the depletion is awful. What lessons are these! Eternity presses upon us on all hands."

"*April 26th.*—At half-past eleven, Dr. Kay wrote as follows:—'May I solicit your prayers on behalf of our dear friend? A change has come over him. I fear he will not last long.' I received this at half-past two (for we are five miles on the other side the river), and Pratt and I determined at once to go over to the College. We arrived before five o'clock. The three doctors were there, and reported a possibility of recovery; but that the medicines had not touched the disease. He wished to see me, and we immediately went up. His appearance was death-like, and though from the spasmodic action of the throat he could not speak, yet his intellect was clear. I simply directed him to the bleeding Lamb, and his one offering for sin, in a few strong words, and then made a short prayer to the same effect—mentioning the righteousness of Christ alone for justification, and the influences of the Holy Spirit for sanctification. I then kissed him, pronounced the benediction, and retired."

'As the Bishop, after thus affectionately ministering to him, was retiring, the dying man raised himself in his bed, and with an effort which taxed all his powers, said, "God bless your Lordship." This proved the last interview.'—Vol. ii. p. 334.

The Bishop's action in this remarkable scene is a trait of manner. Incidentally we gather, that casting aside ordinary English reserve, he was in the habit of demonstrating feeling or affection by this unusual mode of expression, just as in other ways his manner and personal habits responded to his character rather than to the custom of the people about him. As an instance of this, it is mentioned, that he always *sat* while preaching; a custom beginning during temporary weakness, but no doubt continued as an unconscious illustration of his view of the preacher's office in his person. No chain of custom will prevent people of strong will and force of character from showing their distinctive points by peculiarities of dress or deportment.

In connexion with the Bishop's mode of treating the widespread stir of Church feeling, we quote the following letter to one of his clergy, asking our readers whether any English Bishop would think it either expedient or becoming to adopt such a tone on a question of Church order, and where no moral guilt or heretical doctrine is assumed:—

"TO A CHAPLAIN IN THE UPPER PROVINCES.

"*Calcutta, Feb. 1852.*—Knowing that your own mind privately is fixed, and has been for years, I did not choose to enter into communication with you except in an official manner.

"2. I have now only to state, that you are hereby required to abstain from all the customs and habits to which the venerable Archdeacon, knowing my mind, objected so properly.

"3. You are not to turn your back on the people when reciting the creeds. You are to preach in your black gown, and not in your surplice. You have an organ and singers who chaunt the *Te Deum*, &c. and sing a Psalm or hymn between the Litany and the Communion service—you will direct them to sing a Psalm or hymn between the Communion service and the sermon also. You are not to use the prayer for the Church Militant

except when the blessed Communion is administered. You are not to call the Communion table an 'Altar.'

"4. The practice of this Diocese is not to be broken in upon by an individual clergyman or his private opinion.

"5. The late Archbishop's circular-letter expressly recommends that no old usage, though in strictness rubrical, is to be revived, nor any new usages introduced in times like the present.

"6. But I take the higher ground—my authority as Bishop, to regulate what usages may be retained, and what omitted in the climate of India; keeping to the practice for an hundred and fifty years at home, as nearly as possible, and to that of my episcopacy for nearly twenty years."—Vol. ii. pp. 358, 359.

First let the reader turn over a leaf to page 361, and he will, in a letter of advice to another Chaplain, how to deal with dissenters, find these words:—

"Nothing can tend to conciliate their minds and bring them back to our Protestant Apostolical Church so much as the kindliness and charity you would thus show them. Repulsion never does good—attraction, always."—Vol. ii. p. 361.

And next let him compare one passage of the letter on the word Altar, with an extract from the Bishop's own diary, on occasion of his receiving the Communion shortly previous to his consecration, with unusual solemnity of feeling:—

"*March 4th, Islington Church, Sunday.*—Blessed Lord, I am now about to partake of Thy body as broken, and to drink Thy blood, as shed for me. Oh, enable me to resign myself to Thee! At Thy altar may I renew my dedication. May I present my body and soul as a living sacrifice. Lord, if Thou callest me to remain here, I would serve Thee with all humility of mind, and all joy of heart in the Gospel of Thy Son. But, Lord, if Thou chooseth me to go, I would here at Thy altar say, 'Here I am, send me.' Lord accept the sacrifice of my will. Lord receive me as Thy servant. Lord be with me, and bless my ministry."—Vol. i. p. 284.

Thus imperiously forbidding to his clergy a language which he permitted to himself; for he carefully disclaims any change of sentiment throughout the whole of his career. But apart from this inconsistency, which illustrates among other things the narrowing effects of controversy, such a letter makes us realize what the administration of such a man was to, and how it must have been regarded by, those who differed from him. Mr. Bateman's book is written for those who agreed with him, who looked on him as a champion; but could any English Bishop take his stand and act so exclusively as head of a party as we see done here?

Our space is already exceeded: we can only string together a few detached passages, to show that Bishop Wilson held himself answerable only to his party; that he regarded himself as the exponent of, and successor to, a party; that within the Church he had no notion of toleration; that he believed himself placed

in India to advance one school, and suppress any, the slightest, divergence from it. First, he kept up a close confidential correspondence with the clerical meeting at Islington, with which he concerted plans of action, and to which he kept renewing his professions of faith :—

“As I grow older, my religion is much more simple. None but Christ. None but Christ. I am weary of novelties in doctrine, morals, discipline, Church-order. I am of the old school of Romaine (whom I remember as a boy in 1792-5), Newton, Cecil, Foster, Robinson, Venn (the elder, whom I once and once only, saw), and above all, Thomas Scott, and Joseph Milner.”—Vol. ii. pp. 206, 207.

He was by no means a Liberal. He simply assumed, and we think believed, that no religious mind could differ from his judicious interpretation either of Holy Scripture or of the Church's formula. We read—

“To teach Christianity without catechisms, forms, or creeds, was impossible.”—Vol. ii. p. 29.

And in his ‘Anti-tractarian’ charge—

“When we speak of the Bible, we understand the Bible soundly interpreted . . . the Bible illustrated and commented upon by the fathers of the Primitive Church, and the learned and devout writers of every period, and opened and expounded in each passing age, by the duly-authorized ministers of Christ.”—Vol. ii. p. 212.

He could not entertain the notion of doubt as to who those ‘duly-authorized ministers’ were in his own time, nor of himself as the voice of this school. He respected antiquity, as shown in such phrases as ‘the good old Gospel in the good old way ;’ but it was the antiquity of his own earliest impressions, the only form in which this sentiment can actuate or even obtain a lodgment in many minds. ‘Father Scott,’ as he calls him, was the real Ancient Father of his reverence.

“But after all my new authors, I turn back to my old commentator, Scott, with a fresh zest. I am now in Ezekiel, in my annual course, and I sit with astonishment at many of his grave and deep remarks, and I hope turn them into prayers. That book is not yet sufficiently valued. I have now been reading him for forty years, and my judgment is that he surpasses all other commentators by far.”—Vol. ii. p. 145.

At Simlah he writes :—

“We had a charming congregation last night at our concluding Wednesday evening lecture. I preached from Hebrews xiii. 20, 21, ‘The God of Peace,’ &c. I made the sermon on the preceding evening, but I had composed one on the same text forty years since, and I remember that when I came down from the pulpit, Mr. Cecil said to me, ‘Well, brother, I see we are hooping the same barrel. It is sound, brother ; it contains everything.’ He meant that the doctrine was exactly his own, and embraced every branch of truth. What a blessed thing to have been kept for forty years in the narrow path, and to be preaching now precisely the same truth, with the same amplitude as I was instructed to do when first setting out.”—Vol. ii. p. 181.

Thus imbued with a sense of what, practically, was little less than infallibility, he indulged in an unusual latitude of censure in the most public and official acts of his life. In his sixth charge:—

‘The plain speaking, which had now become habitual to him, is very manifest, and breaks through the reserve common on such occasions. Names are mentioned, books are denounced, and systems condemned without reserve: and he seemed more than ever resolved that the last notes of the trumpet should give no uncertain sound. “Don’t tinker it,” he said to his son, when an edition was called for in England, “don’t leave out plain words, such as ‘shuffle.’”—Vol. ii. p. 344.

And the same licence was freely permitted in his more private and individual action. ‘Prayer in his own way,’ was essential to him, and what this ‘way’ was in which he compelled others to join, and what his view of the nature and *basis* of prayer, we gather from the following passage. Having previously said that he went very much into detail:—

“I am so surprised at the Bishop’s prayers,” said a lady, who was staying at the Palace; “are they really prayers?” “I will tell him what you say,” said his Chaplain, “and ask him your question.” “Tell her,” said the Bishop, when this purpose was carried into effect, “to read her Bible, and mark the prayers of Moses, David, Isaiah, Jeremiah, Daniel, Nehemiah, and others; she will find that discussion and narration is the basis of prayer. All these talked with God.”—Vol. ii. p. 443.

And in his sermons he put no more restraint on himself:—

‘His lectures on the Epistles to Timothy or Titus, to his candidates for Ordination, have been already alluded to. They were invaluable—full of force, and calculated to impress the mind most beneficially. But here also he sometimes forgot himself, and said more than he meant. The candidates were required to take down the lectures, and the examination of their notes formed part of the preparatory trial. On one occasion, some quick, clever candidates took down every word; but before the papers were submitted to the Bishop, they brought them to his Chaplain, pointing out many odd remarks and strong expressions, and asking whether they should be left out. “Not a line, not a letter,” said the Chaplain. The papers were accordingly handed in, and the perusal of them was to the Bishop like a man beholding his natural face in a glass. He could scarcely believe that the expressions were correct; but, undeceived on this point, the last morning’s lecture was very much taken up in modifying the previous statements, and preventing all consequent misunderstandings. Especially having said that “he would rather be a poor little Baptist with God’s grace in his heart, than the Archbishop of Canterbury without it;” he was anxious to explain, that though he stood to the sentiment, he would not have them picture to themselves an Archbishop of Canterbury without grace in his heart.”—Vol. ii. pp. 442, 443.

Of his personal manner a friend writes:—

“About his manner of speech and action there were some peculiarities, and even eccentricities, which might have proved fatal to the credit and influence of a more ordinary man; but in him, like the somewhat corresponding qualities in Rowland Hill, they served only to impart a certain

spicy zest to all his appearances, alike public and private."—Vol. ii. p. 425.

Now, what we would ask is, how is this line of action likely to have impressed those who differed from the Bishop's views, and yet had to work under him? If we like people very much, we like to be ruled, or even domineered over by them, and we like their eccentricities, but unless we do, harshness and oddities alienate us. How would all this seem to the men whom the Bishop browbeat and denounced in their own person, or through their friends? We know nothing but what Mr. Bateman tells us; we only ask and guess. We need scarcely say, that we are viewing Daniel Wilson, not as a private Christian in the freedom of individual opinion, in the society and companionship of sympathising friends, but as a Bishop at the head of his clergy—a body of men committed to the language and formularies of our Prayer-book, but not to Romaine, or Cecil, or an Islington clerical meeting. Mr. Bateman, while eschewing all other controversy, found it impossible; nor would he have wished to avoid that particular field of discussion which touches ourselves; and as he found the subject unavoidable, so do we. But this is not the occasion, even if we had will or space for treating more fully the questions at issue. With such zeal, with such strength of will, with such unabated industry, Bishop Daniel Wilson ruled first as Bishop, and then as Metropolitan of India, from 1832 to the opening of 1857. The details of undying energy in failing strength; of habits of study and devotion; of work persevered in up to the moment of death, are full of character. His faith and composure of spirit, his remarkable method, and that necessity to be doing which pursued him through life, were all concentrated in one dying act, where he writes the following 'private note,' and *sends it to be copied* :—

"No. 17. Bishop's private Notes. Jan. 1st. Friday evening, 7½ P.M. All going on well; but I am dead almost. D. C. (Daniel Calcutta.) Firm in hope."

"These words were partially, but not completely torn from the sheet. Probably, even for this, his strength sufficed not; and he sent it as it was into the Archdeacon's room to be entered in the book."—Vol. ii. p. 415.

As we witness this extreme activity, and the passionate love of business which distinguished him, we would remark, that the admiration so often expressed for his dying at his post, is all testimony to his belonging to a certain class of character, rather than to any possible yearning or temptation to a contrary course, withstood in his case. There was no resistance here; no opposing claims to be put aside. Daniel Wilson's friends can never have seriously proposed or desired his resigning his

episcopate, and retiring into private life, they must have known that such a step could not possibly contribute to any one's happiness or comfort. There are persons who have no privacy, who care for no individual exclusive intercourse, who have no secrets—Daniel Wilson was one of them. Fancy such a man, after such a life of congenial honourable labour, confined 'to the bosom of his family.' What a blank to him! Life had never presented such an idea to his mind; it had been from nineteen an unceasing intercourse with the world, with business, with assemblages of men, gatherings, meetings, contests. Bustle, stir, excitement, were as necessary to him as the play of the winds to our atmosphere. Think what the transition would have been from all this rapid current of life, to a torpid existence, with nobody to write to, with nobody dependent on his movements, with no orders to issue, nothing to superintend, nobody to govern. A charming essay has been written lately on the two ideas of 'giving up' and 'coming down.' Daniel Wilson was equally incapable of doing either. He is a remarkable instance of keeping himself together. Fineness and delicacy of perception was not one of his qualities, but a certain strength and tenacity of tissue essential to a 'career' is a marked quality. A firm faith—faith in its true, real, religious sense, and faith in himself—worked in its complex character to sustain a remarkable consistency of thought and career, a consistency materially assisted by the finality, as well as promptitude, of his decisions. He was incapable of thinking over a thing twice. His mind once made up, never hesitated or doubted again. So having, amongst other matters, decided to live and die in India, the question never presented itself to him again.

But it is full time to conclude. Bishop Wilson's friends and his biographer have, in treating his character, adopted such a strain of reverential eulogy—falling one and all into a certain dialect of Scripture phrases and allusions, as if no other language could adequately meet the occasion—that we are conscious our more critical strain may be distasteful to them. We are not insensible to the testimony to excellence, which the sincere eulogy of friends affords. It is no light thing for a man's party to see in his character and circumstances a close analogy to those of S. Paul; but such a view is sure to act against freedom of treatment, and even against a candid investigation of facts and qualities. To us, who only know the Bishop through these pages, and who find there some points in his character and conduct with which we cannot sympathise, a different duty presents itself. We have had to look for the causes which made a good and pious man insensible to certain needs of the human

mind, and violently opposed to men—zealous and pious also—who have sought to justify and to supply their needs. It is only by a scrutiny of character and springs of action that these can be found. But beyond this particular ground for study, and independent of such considerations, we are always ready to maintain that the value of biography as a source of knowledge, as a science for enlarging our insight into human nature, depends on courage and candour, and that the best justice to every character worth reading at all, is to ascertain the full truth concerning it.

- ART. V.—*A Review of the Ulster Revival in the year 1859.*
By the Rev. RICHARD OULTON, Jun., A.M., Perpetual Curate of Altedesart, Diocese of Armagh. Dublin: Hodges, Smith, & Co. 1859.
2. *The Journal of Mental Science. Articles:—The Work and the Counter-work.* By EDWARD A. STOPFORD, Archdeacon of Meath. *Ulster Revivalism; a Retrospect.* By the Rev. W. M'ILWAINE, A.M., January, 1860. London: Longmans.
 3. *The Revival.* By W. M. WILKINSON. London: Chapman and Hall. 1860.
 4. *Revivalism Reviewed.* By the Rev. W. M'ILWAINE, A.M.
 5. *Speech of Rev. W. M'ILWAINE, at Belfast Conference of Evangelical Alliance.*
 6. *God's Work and Satan's Counterwork.* By the Rev. E. HINCKS, D.D. Rector of Killyleagh.

No intelligent observer of the signs of the times can have failed to notice the feverishness of the public mind for the last few months. This morbid condition has been especially marked in reference to religion. At the present moment, strange and ill-defined anticipations of a new Pentecost are falling, in awful shadows or stormy sunlight, upon the turbid stream of sectarianism. Only a few weeks ago, for instance, there appeared an advertisement from certain Missionaries in Loo-diana, calling upon God's people in every isle and continent, to hold prayer-meetings for a special and immediate outpouring of the Spirit. The invitation was accompanied by a direction to fast upon the Monday immediately succeeding the feast of the Epiphany, in the midst of that season, which both the practice of the Universal Church, and the custom of English homes, have associated with peculiar joy; and to hold a service of thanksgiving upon another specified Monday. This modest encyclical, issued by a few Baptist or Presbyterian Missionaries, and since endorsed by one Bishop and a handful of London Incumbents, has been received with nearly as much observance as if it had proceeded from a patriarchal chair. We perceive advertisements already of 'the first great drops of the coming shower,' and we are credibly informed, that the Ulster 'prostrations,' which seized a hundred little children in Coleraine one fine morning last summer, have been imported into certain Ragged Schools!¹

This excitement had no doubt its origin, to some degree, in

¹ In Southey's 'Life of Wealey,' will be found an account of a Methodist

the coincidence of the near approach of the culminating date in the Apocalypse, as interpreted by a popular contemporary school, with a European war, whose results seemed likely to affect the temporal power of the Papacy. But the Ulster revival has afforded it the most powerful stimulus. The end of that singular movement, according to 'J. C.' in his letter to the *Times* newspaper, (can this be a *second* indirect puff of a certain book, clearly, according to the *Clerical Journal*, reviewed by its own author in the same columns?) is not, as might have been supposed, to make the women of Antrim and Derry chaste, and the men sober; to teach them to care for better things than whiskey and yarn; to diminish their liking for law, and their hatred for Papists. That sort of thing is too low for his aspirations. It is to prepare them for the 'Great Tribulation,' which is at hand.

Under these circumstances—at a period when many of our readers may possibly be obliged to make up their minds and to act in reference to revivalism—we venture to address ourselves to the general history and results of the Irish Revival, illustrated from private and public sources. We shall then apply our conclusions to the duty of English Churchmen. And if a social phenomenon so complex and manysided—where good so subtly slides into evil, and evil into good—may, after all, defy our analysis: if our facts are imperfectly generalised, and our conclusions vague and vacillating; we shall at least have the satisfaction of pointing to the best sources of information.

I. And, *first*, in reference to the history of the Ulster revival, it is important to remark, that it followed a geographical line of propagation. It was not simultaneous, but progressive. It was not like 'the lightning, coming out of the east, and shining even to the west:' it was rather like a long ill-laid train of damped gunpowder, fizzing and sputtering, and requiring the aid of extraneous sparks.¹

It is necessary to bear this fact in mind. Persons, unacquainted with Ireland, look upon the Revival as a great simultaneous

School, at Kingswood, where children from seven to eight years old were allowed to have no rest, 'until they had obtained a clear feeling of the pardoning love of God.' Wesley at the time encouraged this act of folly, which we have no doubt he afterwards deplored. After a few months, he writes:—'Passed an hour among the children at Kingswood. Strange! What is become of the work of grace which God, last September, wrought among the boys! It is gone! It is vanished!' We can prove by painful facts that prostrations among children often end in fearful epilepsy.

¹ Since writing the above, we have seen the following confirmation in a pamphlet by Dr. Carson, of Coleraine, a thorough-paced revivalist. 'The revival has not leaped from the north to the south, nor from the east to the west, of the island. On the contrary, it has followed a steady, gradual, progressive, and uninterrupted course, from parish to parish, and district to district. It has travelled almost like a wave. This is a fact which is patent to all.'

outburst. They have been told that it did not follow ordinary lines of propagation. The harp of Protestantism was, they suppose, at once and mysteriously swept by the finger of the Unseen.

Mr. Mill, somewhere, sneers rather coarsely at those poor parents who console themselves, as they look at their helpless offspring, by the reflection that the little ones are sent by heaven. Under the coarseness of the taunt there is a useful lesson for those who attribute to Divine Providence the results of their own choice. We would almost apply this to revivalist histories of the revival. If it be true that the child was heaven-sent, it is also no less distinctly true that its production was due to under-agency, busy, restless, and noisy. We know of no district, in which the revival has made way, where the very day of its appearance could not be assigned.

The American Revival attracted peculiar attention in Ulster. Those quaint letters, written by the northern peasant to his home, beginning, 'dear friends,' and ending with special love to Paddy, Barney, Biddy, Mr. M'Afee, and every individual within two miles, between the price of potatoes, and the glories of Philadelphia, interjected some marvel of the Great Revival. America, too, is ever returning some drops of the great Irish wave of emigration. There were those in the north upon whom these hints were not lost.

The population of Ulster has a large and influential Presbyterian element. The poor, indeed, are mainly Roman Catholic, with a considerable infusion of 'Protestants,' a term exclusively given to members of the church. The higher orders are almost, without exception, 'Protestants.' It is a common taunt that when a Presbyterian can keep a carriage, he always drives to church. But the class of peasantry, just above the cottier; the tenant-farmers, and freeholders; the bleachers of the district about the Bann; the 'lappers,' and their employers, are, by an overwhelming majority, Presbyterians. A strange race they are, with characteristics, not easily described in a few words. They are cool, money-making, hard-drinking, apparently hard-headed, and unenthusiastic. But those who know them well, know that under the Scotch exterior are hidden some of the explosive elements of native Irish excitableness. Under the influence of grief, they will wail and weep with southern passion. When the 'convoy' parts from the emigrant at the railway-station, or on the quay, the sound of sobbing haunts the traveller's ear for minutes afterwards.¹ Their hard dull Scottish dialect occasionally

¹ These mingling ingredients in the northern Irish temperament are forgotten by those writers, who wish to enhance the marvels of the revival, by denying that constitutional excitableness had anything to do with the matter. Thus, Mr.

glimmers with scintillations of Irish poetry and eloquence. They are intensely social. The opinion of 'the neighbours' is omnipotent with them. A man cannot die alone. The whole 'town' gathers into the kitchen. A widow cannot weep alone, nor a family pass the last evening in private with the member who is to sail for Australia the next morning. The news that a decent farmer's wife has 'something about her heart' will ensure her a *levée* which a Prime Minister's wife might envy. Professing, for the most part, the hardest and least poetical of Christian creeds, they are deeply superstitious. The sacred symbol of our redemption over the meeting-house would be to them an abomination in the holy place. They abhor ritual. An organ is 'a kist of whistles,' fit only for the mass-house. They are profoundly anti-sacramental. Yet, with all this, they are believers in ghosts, omens, and witches, and have a curious smouldering faith in holy water, and in the power of Roman priests to cure all diseases. Their taste for theology is wonderful. They can discuss predestination and perseverance. The choice of a minister is the event of their lives. Sermon after sermon is preached. Candidate after candidate is tested. Loudness of voice is an eminent qualification. Party-spirit runs high on these occasions.

Now the persons upon whom we have said that these hints from America were not lost,¹ were the Presbyterian ministers. On the whole, we are inclined to think that these gentlemen were beginning to lose ground. Some at least were said to be no less fond of farming and tilling land than their elders. The hold of others over their congregations was supposed to arise from money-lending transactions. Yet some among them were men of an austere morality—exhibiting a religion destitute, perhaps, of the finer shadings which are only to be found in better systems, and of a Judaical temperament—but cast in the stern mould of Knox and Rutherford. The doctrines preached in the meeting-houses were pretty well identical. Predestination and reprobation, the new birth, assurance and perseverance, and their correlatives, were everywhere announced. The larger towns always formed a rallying point, and the pulpits were filled with men, rarely indeed of large acquirements or of lofty eloquence, but exquisitely trained in those petty artifices of management,

Wilkinson says:—'It comes from Protestant, Presbyterian, hard, common sense, Scotch Ulster.' Mr. William Arthur remarks:—'The people are notoriously cool, practical, money-making, strong-willed, and fond of disputation.' Dr. Massie has much to the same effect.

¹ Mr. Moore says, 'Besides, tidings of the American Revival reached this country. Our church courts directed ministers to consider the subject, and to preach on it. This was generally done throughout our Presbytery. American newspapers, especially the *New York Observer*, were regularly read by some of us.'

and airs of popular-preacher sanctity, which are much better adapted to influence the classes which these men aspire to lead. Some of the severer men of whom we have spoken in the county of Antrim, and who looked upon their communion with grief, were taken with these American narratives. Why should not Ulster have a revival? A friend, of great discrimination, well acquainted with the country, remarked to us that he knew what would happen months before the agitation actually commenced.

The congregation of Ahoghill, near Ballymena, had the honour, so far as we know, of furnishing the first 'cases.' Fired with recollections of Glendinning, who had got up a great revival in Antrim about 1640, though he soon became a maniac, their ministers soon worked them up to fever point. A few courses of sermons on particular subjects, a selection of revival literature, and a series of narratives and anecdotes of Cambuslang and New England, are, as a matter of fact, generally sufficient to produce more or less of these manifestations. 'Cases' accordingly soon began to happen, which were naturally looked upon with awe, and spoken of far and wide for several weeks. They were taken up from pulpit to pulpit, until the rumour of a great work of God spread right and left.

From Ahoghill the movement soon came into Ballymena. The 'striking' there were numerous, and, while familiarity and discussion had not worn off the strangeness, exceedingly aggravated in their physical symptoms. The rector of the town was obliged to appeal publicly on behalf of the many poor weavers who were unable to resume their work. It was burning summer. The crowded meetings of terrified creatures, often protracted through the night, were the theatres of a fearful excitement. Once a thunder-storm darkened over the place of gathering. While one 'convert' preached of hell-fire, and another shrieked that the Spirit was coming among them, a flash of summer lightning filled the house. A scene ensued which beggars description. Yells for mercy arose. The people fell right and left. Over the black bog it travelled to Coleraine by Ballymena. In the opposite direction, it went by Antrim to a mill or factory in Belfast, kept by a Methodist. Forty 'cases' in one night made it the wonder of that considerable city. From Ballymena, then, and Belfast the revival of 1859 radiated, as its two centres. On the one side, it travelled to the County Down; on the other, it passed to Portrush from Coleraine. It struck out over the bleaching-grounds to Garvagh, Kilrea, Maghea, and Bellaghy. Everywhere the great wave broke, and circled in eddies among the hills. It took the train to Derry. It entered that city on Whitsunday. Thence it

worked on restlessly to Strabane, Omagh, Enniskillen, and step by step up the wild parishes of Tyrone. Nor did its agents neglect the towns in the back part of Donegal.

So far our sketch is, we are sure, substantially accurate. We are unable to make it as complete as we could wish. We can form no probable estimate of the number of the 'stricken.' On the one hand, it must be admitted to be very considerable. We ourselves know of one country place, where little excitement occurred at a great meeting, until a 'convert' pointed upward, and said he saw our Lord coming, when instantly *fifty* fell. On the other hand, the exaggeration used has been most unblushing.¹ A dissenting minister stated that the 'conversions' in a certain town amounted to several hundreds a day, where we are quite sure that fifty would have been an extreme figure for the whole agitation. But we have probably stated enough to establish our position, that the revival was propagated by direct, palpable, human agency, in geographical and chronological progression. The people of Portrush, for instance, could mention the date of the day on which the great meeting was held. They could ascertain, or they remember, the names of those converts who were marched from Ballymoney, under the burning sun, up their street, and whom the Church-clergymen of the parish employed to address, and to pray for, the multitude. They could point out those who 'fell' on that occasion.

So far we have spoken of the geographical and chronological progress of the Ulster Revival. Its accompaniments were pretty nearly as follows:—

In the first instance, it was generally heralded by a vague, wild rumour pervading the district to which it approached. None who were resident in any of the tracts which the revival reached, can ever forget the ominous gloom of preparation. At every table, among the upper classes, the question was discussed. The Roman Catholic peasantry were universally under the impression that there was 'a loosing of Satan for a season.' This, too, was the teaching of many of the Roman Catholic clergy; some, however, advocating the subtler and more

¹ *Exaggeration* seems to mingle, as if necessarily, with all that is written in favour of the Irish Revival. The *Quarterly Review* sets the numbers of converts from Rome at 1,000. Now such converts generally collapse upon inquiry into a stray farm-servant here and there. From a general acquaintance with four counties, we are not afraid to assert, that between Ballymena and Omagh, Newtown-Limavada, and Melin, *one hundred* such converts could not be produced, and of the hundred not *ten* who could give any rational account of the matter. The account of the stir in Connaught is also purely mythical. It is within our knowledge that the writer of one of the best and most logical pamphlets on the revival side, having committed himself to a wholesale statement of its prodigious moral results, frankly confessed in private, that he did not personally know *one case* of such a change.

charitable hypothesis, that the movement was the wild, undisciplined expression of wants which found no satisfaction in Protestantism. The Protestant population might be divided into two sections. There were simple and tender minds, who went to the meetings to receive the baptism of the Holy Ghost. Agitated, weary, fasting sometimes for several days, sitting up night after night among crowded masses, listening to terrific addresses—these poor creatures ‘fell’ like sheep. There were others who feared and dreaded ‘the thing that was going,’ predisposing themselves by terror not less than the others by anticipation. When ‘cases’ became numerous in any district—not before—prostrations occurred, independently of contact with meetings. The ‘girl’—*Anglicè*, maid-servant—fell down as she was washing potatoes. A tingling sensation passed from the soles of her feet upward. Her face became pale, her hair dishevelled, her eyes distended. Her chest heaved; she complained of ‘a load on her heart;’¹ she spoke of *sin*,—i. e. so far as we know, invariably of abstract sinfulness, rarely, if ever, of actual positive sin. Then, after moments, hours, or even days, as the case might be, the oppression passed away with tears. A bright smile flitted across the features. Peace and rapture were expressed. Something of the same kind occurred in several instances to men. The ‘boy,’ weeding turnips, fell into the *shough*, pale and livid. Carried into the house, he lay upon the bed, his low ejaculations witnessing to some vision of heaven and hell. Or the young man, up in ‘the moss,’ cutting turf, suddenly dropped his spade. His eyes rolled round, until the ball became a blood-streaked jelly. His teeth met through his white lips; his chin was dashed with blood; his muscular frame grew limp or frigid. Sometimes these symptoms were modified into little more than rather unusual agitation. Sometimes they were aggravated into fearful frenzy. We have heard, from trustworthy eye-witnesses, of those who would have torn the flesh from their bones, but for bystanders; of others who had to be strapped down, and carried off to the Asylum. These singular, and to many unaccountable, circumstances, magnified by rumour, and stamped by divine authentication from influential pulpits—in which it was taught that the Holy Spirit was (as Jonathan Edwards said) ‘localised’ in the district; that, to use the almost invariable expression, He was ‘passing over you; *will none of ye be struck?*’—produced an indescribable effect. It was not such sweet and gracious expectation as moved round our Redeemer’s gracious progress; such attraction as drew to Him

¹ A Clergyman writes to the *Dublin Express*, ‘Mrs. C. said she felt heavy for some days, and had to hold up her *heart*, putting her hands to her *stomach*;’ i. e. to the ganglionic *plexus*, the seat of hysteria.

all susceptible hearts. It was not the quiet blessedness that seems to brood over the communicants in one of our churches, when, not without upward looks and hidden tears, faithful hearts draw near to the Holy Eucharistic feast. It was the attraction of *magnetization*, rather than of moral sympathy. It was physical fascination, rather than spiritual faith. It was not so much solemnity as a gloom in which 'all faces gathered blackness.'

This was but the preparation. The 'stricken ones' were generally termed 'convicts.' When the 'convicts' had ripened into 'converts,' these 'converts,' *alias* 'the illuminated,' or 'the boys' (who, by the way, were pretty generally *girls*), entered the nearest town, singing Presbyterian psalms, or Methodist hymns, or some of Mr. M'Comb's strange rhymes. A great meeting was held in some school-house or meeting-house. Ministers of various denominations attended. 'Striking' and 'falling' ensued; shrieks and yells burst forth. In the streets strange-looking creatures, with wild eyes and open Bible in hand, held forth to larger or smaller groups. A succession of excitements was kept up for several months. Low-church curates from various parts of England, half-pay officers in the army, ministers of various denominations, Presbyterian teachers, whose expenses were paid by Mr. Peter Drummond of Stirling, American ladies, little boys,—

'Raved, recited, madden'd round the land.'

This was pretty well for a movement of which its admirers have said that it was in no degree promoted by preaching, and even that it was characterised by the absence of all excitement. Further, burning coal was placed under the seething kettle of bubbling fanaticism. Presbyterian ministers could meet Romish miracles with a horse-laugh, evangelical preachers with a sneer or a reference to Paley. Now for a short season they turned thaumaturgists themselves, and the country teemed with miraculous stories.

One of the commonest of these was the '*reading marracle*.' The following anecdote, vouched for by Dr. Massie, may stand for an example:—

'From our memoranda of cases wherein strong mental convictions have been accompanied by new and mysterious operations upon the physical condition of the parties affected, we submit the following record of phenomena as brought under our special notice on the evening of Saturday last. There is not a shadow of doubt as to the facts; and if they are capable of explanation upon natural principles, we must leave their elucidation to the ingenuity of more profound philosophers. The party to whom we refer is a young and healthy woman, but utterly uneducated,—unacquainted even with the letters of the alphabet. She is a servant in the house of a pious and respectable farmer, an elder of one of the

Presbyterian churches of Ballymena, and resident in a neighbouring district. We shall call her Mary. . . . On the first Sabbath of June last Mary was severely, and very properly, rebuked by a member of her master's family, for indulging in the vicious habit of swearing; on which occasion she jeeringly replied that she would attend at a prayer-meeting to be held at a neighbouring arm, and *get the revival*. She did attend the meeting. In the course of the services conviction fell upon her soul. A shock like electricity thrilled every nerve, and, yielding to an irresistible impulse, she loudly called for Heaven's mercy. She returned to her master's house in agonies of penitence. Her conviction of sin was not succeeded by any real conversion to newness of life, for she had no consciousness of pardon nor feeling that she was at peace with God. She remained in this unhappy state till the 23d; on the evening of which day, and in a serious spirit, she attended a prayer-meeting at Ballycloughan. Here she was prostrated as before, and was brought back in a state of great excitement, unable to articulate a word. The scene which then ensued took place in the presence of her master and many other witnesses, who are all ready to confirm the statement, if need be, upon oath. For some minutes Mary remained standing apparently unconscious of surrounding objects. Several times she struck the floor with her foot, and raised her arms towards Heaven, but she remained speechless. After a while she became less agitated, and sunk into a reclining position, her eyes closed, except at intervals, when they were raised upward in a gaze of fixed intensity. While in this attitude some one put into her hand a copy of the New Testament; she grasped it eagerly, held it up at the full stretch of her arm, and then pressed it to her breast. Now it must be remembered this poor girl was utterly unable to read, and up to this moment cannot distinguish the right or wrong position of a printed book. After some time she extended her arms upon her lap and opened the book, her face being turned up and her eyes closed. Thus she turned over the pages as if in search of some particular passage. Having found it, she deliberately began to read the fourteenth chapter of the gospel of St. John, beginning with the first line, and slowly, as if in reading time, she traced with the point of her finger, without sight of eye or motion of lip, every word of that chapter, ending with the last line. She then deliberately marked that portion of Scripture by folding in the leaf, so that its point exactly came to the beginning of the chapter. She then renewed her search for other passages in the Testament, and did not cease her examination till apparently at peace in her mind, and satisfied with the investigation. In this way she fixed upon twenty-three portions of Holy Scripture, running her finger along the selected lines, which sometimes comprised two or three verses. In every case she marked each passage by turning down the leaf, so that it pointed to the figure of the verses she had studied. This solemn scene lasted for about five hours, and its effect upon the bystanders may be easily conceived. Her master occasionally led the assembly in prayer, and all present were affected with tears. The book, with every mark in it, was secured by her master on the spot, and it is before us at the present moment. We have examined it with care, and can state that the marked passages bear with pointed accuracy upon the Gospel plan for the redemption of our fallen race, and the restoration of peace and hope to the Christian. Every passage as traced by the seemingly unconscious girl was read aloud by her master for this purpose. The book was often taken from her hands, and it is worthy of remark that when it happened to be returned to her with the leaves inverted, she invariably restored the book to its proper position. On one occasion, after Mary had paused in the usual manner, and traced the lines of a portion of Scripture, her master took the book and read the passage aloud, without

observing that she had not marked the verse. The book was then returned to her closed. She opened it immediately, her hands trembling with agitation, and turning over the leaves as if in anxious search for something she had lost, she found, retraced, and marked the identical verse that her master had just read. At another time, after she had traced a passage, and was apparently pondering it, her master removed the book, read the passage, and then marked it himself. On regaining the book, Mary became somewhat excited. She searched for her master's mark, found it, erased it carefully by unfolding the corner of the leaf, which she then pressed with her fingers to smooth away the crease. In this mysterious state of mind and body the girl remained from ten o'clock at night till three on the following morning. On regaining her natural condition, she had no distinct recollection of anything that had occurred from the time of her prostration at the prayer-meeting, except a strong and abiding impression that she had been tempted by the Evil One or by her own evil heart to unbelief, and that she had found help, defence, sustaining grace, and consolation, in the sacred volume. We repeat our assurance that there is not a doubt as to the facts of this case. Can medical science, or intellectual philosophy, explain the phenomena? Any suggestion of imposition on the part of Mary must be silenced by the fact that she does not know a letter of the alphabet; and we have only to add that by every witness of the occurrence, the guiding power, the temporary illumination of mind, is attributed to the agency of the Holy Ghost.—*The Revival.* By W. M. Wilkinson, p. 101.

Now, granting the accuracy of this representation (and, with our knowledge of the measure of truth contained in similar stories, we should not be prepared to admit a tithe of it¹), it is but a faint shadow indeed of the mysterious powers which have been elicited by animal magnetism, or exhibited by persons in somnambulism or hysteria. It would seem as if memory had capacities which are beyond the most delicate analysis; as if all sounds, impressions, sensations, thoughts, once conveyed to the mind, cannot skim over it superficially; but, when they seem to us to fade away, are but deposited under a mysterious veil, which peculiar nervous or cerebral conditions have the power of uplifting for a moment. In some of the most beautiful sentences which the literature of philosophy possesses, Locke speaks of 'ideas in the mind quickly fading, and often vanishing 'quite out of the understanding, leaving no more footsteps or 'remaining directions of themselves than shadows do flying

¹ Few persons are good witnesses, because few are accurate observers. Most people associate their own inferences indissolubly with facts, and state that as a fact which is but an opinion. Miss Nightingale remarks, in language worthy of the Archbishop of Dublin in his happiest vein, 'It is a much more difficult thing 'to speak the truth than people commonly imagine. There is the want of observation *simple*, and the want of observation *compound*; that is, compounded 'with the imaginative faculty. The second has observed just as little, but imagination steps in, and he describes the whole thing from imagination merely, being 'perfectly convinced, all the while, that he has seen or heard it.'—*Notes on Nursing*, p. 60. Miss Nightingale's strictures have, to our knowledge, as ample illustration in a Revival-meeting as in a hospital.

'over fields of corn.' This conception he further illustrates by a cluster of analogies scarcely less exquisite. 'The ideas, as well as children of our youth, often die before us; and our minds represent to us those tombs to which we are approaching; where, though the brass and marble remain, yet the inscriptions are effaced by time, and the imagery moulders away. The pictures drawn in our minds are laid in fading colours; and, if not sometimes refreshed, vanish and disappear. It may seem probable that the constitution of the body does sometimes influence the memory, since we oftentimes find a disease quite strip the mind of all its ideas, and the flames of a fever, in a few days, calcine all those images to dust and confusion, which seemed to be as lasting as if ground in marble.' This richly-coloured passage is yet partial and inadequate. The *paupertina philosophia* of sensationalism is manifest in it, and the profusion of material analogies involves a fallacy of comparison. The essential difference between the things compared is kept out of sight. One class of phenomena is brought forward, another and opposite unnoticed. For full and accurate natural analogies we must have corn-fields that, under magic gleams of sunlight, can reproduce every shadow that has swept over their surface; buried children, whom we suppose to be covered with the sod, but who ever and anon stand before us as of old; inscriptions and images that seem to be mouldering, but carve themselves out anew; pictures that recolour themselves by some strange restorative process; charred and calcined shapes that suddenly resuscitate themselves from the embers of their decay. If memory has strange wastings, a genuine psychology will show that it has yet stranger revivals. Sudden revelations bring out before us the minutest incident. The old man's remembrance is often more wonderful than his forgetfulness. It would seem as if memory might more accurately be likened to a chamber covered with the drifting sands, which, when they are swept away, presents us with colours almost as vivid as the day when they were laid on. This is a digression, perhaps, but it bears upon the matter before us. Those who have read Abercrombie's anecdote of the servant-girl who repeated in Hebrew portions of psalms which she had heard her master declaiming long before, will not be ready to exalt an effect of disease into miraculous knowledge. The germs of this exhibition, the texts, had long before and frequently been pressed, as it were, and trodden into the soil of 'Ballymena Mary's' memory. But they lay there cramped and bedridden. The stimulus of excitement was now supplied; the hard mould was loosened; and the texts began to spring up. The reading, *if well attested,*

would admit of an analogous solution. We crave leave to doubt whether it be 'an unquestionable fact that Mary does not know a single letter of the alphabet.' Of the individual case we know nothing; but in several other cases which we have thoroughly investigated, we have found that the miracle simply amounts to this:—Persons who could read very imperfectly, and who had discontinued the use of books for a longer or shorter period, under the prevalent impulse were seized with a desire to peruse the Scriptures. Assisted by a motive, and aided by those reminiscences of passages which haunt all hearts and ears in a Christian land, these simple students found the task easier than they could have supposed. One of the most pleasing sights which we witnessed during the Revival was an elderly man sitting with his spectacles on, and reading out of a large New Testament, about as well as a child of ten years old in a village-school. To his neighbours the achievement appeared prodigious. To us, upon investigation, it appeared that the wonder lay altogether in the choice of the volume, not at all in the quality of the scholarship which was applied to it. The 'illuminated' was a carman, and admitted that while he had given up books for many years, he was able to read the names over doors or shops. Now it is not very sceptical to suggest that he who could manage to puzzle out, *e.g.* 'John 'M'Crosky, licensed to sell spirits and ale; good entertainment 'for man and beast,' might, without miraculous intervention, contrive to make out a verse in the nineteenth chapter of St. John.

The preachings and prayings of the converts were very generally considered miraculous. Mr. Moore of Ballymena thus writes:—

'Fluency is characteristic of the prayers of not a few. The supplications of some are condensed. To those of others—*principally females*—belongs a fluency, a sweet reverential familiarity, a *poetry*, altogether inconceivable by parties who have not heard them. I have *sat* confounded, *humbled to the dust*, in the presence of these supplicants. In fact, the productions are quite beyond the powers of the human mind, whether renewed or unrenewed, in its ordinary state.'—*History of Revival in Ballymena*, p. 23.

Valeat quantum. To be a competent judge of that which surpasses the limits of the human mind, one must also be, in some sense, a competent judge of its powers and faculties. It is a pity that this poor gentleman did not preserve some specimens, that impartial critics might decide. The production of a single fragment, 'quite beyond the powers of the human mind,' would have saved a world of trouble. Yet, after all, the evidence might have been like that which Mahommedans deduce from the Koran. 'The book,' say they to the Giaour, 'is miraculous—

its style is a proof of its divine origin.' 'How so?' is the sceptic's inquiry. 'It is perfect Arabic.' 'But how do you establish that?' 'Dog of an infidel! it is so decided by our muftis.' We are afraid that the divinity of revivalist sacred literature would have, in the last analysis, to rest upon the infallible discernment of Presbyterian mufti.

In some instances, miraculous cures, especially of impediment in the speech, were claimed. We cite one instance from the *Ballymena Observer*, which has attracted considerable attention, and has been quoted in English newspapers:—

'INTERESTING NARRATIVE BY DAVID CRESWELL, A ROMAN CATHOLIC
CONVERT.

'I was born in the neighbourhood of Londonderry, and have lived the greater part of my life there, where I am well known. I am now eighteen years of age, and until two months ago I was never able to speak so that I could be understood. I was not dumb, but was born with some natural impediment which, during all the previous part of my life, deprived me of the power of intelligible utterance. I have been taught to work as a stone mason; and, until two months ago, I was a Roman Catholic, a drunkard, and, so far as my will was concerned and my stammering tongue permitted it, I was a blasphemer. I was as bad a character as any man could be, for I was not in Christ. Some time ago I went to work at Moneymore, in the employment of Daniel Magee. When the revival movement commenced there I used to go to some of the meetings, but it was only to hang about the outskirts and mock at the people; I took no other interest in them, for my heart was hardened. Shortly after midnight, on Sunday, the 19th of June last, I was passing the open door of a private house in Moneymore, in which place the Rev. Dr. Barnett was engaged at prayer. I had no intention of going in, but, when right opposite the door, I heard the reverend gentleman saying some words about the Lord Jesus Christ which attracted my curiosity. A power, which I firmly believe to have been exercised by the Spirit of God upon me, inclined me to go in. I entered, and was not long in the house until I knelt with the people of it; but my heart was not touched. When Dr. Barnett left the house, I followed him along the street. I did not want to speak with him, but I felt an impulse to proceed with him to another house where the people wanted him to pray. Just then some weakness—some strange feeling that I am unable to explain—came over me. I could not stand, and I fell prostrate upon the street. Up to that moment I had no thought about religion, or the state of my soul, and I had not been excited by anything or in any way. It was just after I had fallen that the Spirit of God—and I am confident that it was nothing else—put the feeling into my heart that I was a sinner, lost and perishing, and that my only hope of salvation was in Christ. I felt a deep conviction of that, and a terror of mind that no words could describe. I did not become insensible; and all the while I felt a weight about my heart, as if something were crushing me through the earth. This was about one o'clock in the night, and some people carried me into the house of James Beatty, where I remained till five o'clock in the morning before I was able to walk to the house in which I was lodged. I could not speak, but my heart prayed to the Lord Jesus. I felt impelled to do so, and I could not get over it. I did not regain my strength for a fortnight, and during that interval I felt ever-changing sensations of fear, and hope, and doubt respecting my soul. At ten o'clock on the night of Saturday, the 2d of July, a fortnight all but one day from the time of my first convic-

tion, I was suddenly struck down a second time, while drinking a cup of tea in my lodging-room ; and from that up till one o'clock on the night of the following Monday I was in deadly terror of my soul. About one o'clock on Monday morning I was brought to believe, to my great comfort, that a good work had been begun in me, under the influence of the Holy Spirit. I felt peace of mind, a firm faith in my Redeemer, and a confident trust that His power would protect and guide me to final salvation. For six years before that I was a drunkard, and also dreadfully addicted to the excessive use of tobacco. I was either smoking it, or chewing it, almost continually. I always went to bed, and to sleep, with tobacco in my mouth, and I could not sleep without it. I have not the slightest inclination either for it or for intoxicating drink now, nor ever had from the hour of my wonderful restoration to speech, and rescue from the dominion of Satan, by an Almighty Power. I thank and praise God for that conversion, and I can never be sufficiently thankful for it. I was a Roman Catholic. I am not one now, nor ever shall be again. From the first moment that I felt the hand of God upon me, and the influence of the Holy Spirit upon my heart, I refused to allow any one to bring a priest to me. In former days, I thought over some prayers off beads, and used to invoke the aid of saints and the Virgin Mary ; but now the Lord has taught me to pray from the heart. I feel that it is sin to put any created being in the room of that blessed Saviour who died for me that I might live ; and if man could work out his own salvation by penance or good works, he might go a conqueror to heaven in his own right, where man never yet entered except as a conqueror 'through Him that loved us.' I know of a good many converts from the Roman Catholic faith, and, in particular, a young man named J. D., who used to attend the priest at R—, in the service of the mass ; and many others, who have talked with me kindly upon the subject, appear to be in great doubt.'

Mr. Oulton, in his exceedingly powerful and valuable pamphlet, shrewdly remarks, 'It is all I know about the matter, and every one can judge, as well as I, for himself. The impression it has made on my mind is a strong disbelief in his veracity and honesty, and in the integrity of the person who wrote the narrative for him, for he never wrote it, or dictated it either in my opinion.'

We can confirm Mr. Oulton's scepticism. Mr. Daniel—not David—Creswell, is a stonemason from the neighbourhood of Londonderry. Part of his statement we believe to be literally true. There can be no doubt that he was 'a drunkard and a blasphemer, and as bad a character as any man could be.' A Roman Catholic he never was, his family being *Presbyterians*. He was violently 'stricken' at a revival meeting in a meeting-house connected with his own district. We are sorry to rob the Rev. Dr. Barnett of a convert, but we have spoken to those who saw Creswell 'lying upon the green,' many miles from Moneymore, about the date of this account in the Ballymena paper. Creswell had beyond doubt a considerable impediment in his speech, and we conclude that it must be granted to his admirers that he recovered, more or less, the use of his tongue ; for we heard of him as a convert preacher several

months ago in the neighbourhood of Coleraine. Even there his assertion that he had been a Roman Catholic excited suspicion and detection. But we have seen that he appears again, with a fresh leaf of gilt upon his faded glories. It is no pleasant task to act as a religious detective; to expose such wretched and disgusting pieces of human imbecility and fanaticism. But it is right that English churchmen should be acquainted with the materials out of which is constructed the miraculous theory of revivalism.

Another class of wonders occurred very largely in some, and perhaps more or less in all districts, where the revival made any way. We allude to those curious instances, in which hysterical or epileptiform affections took the form of temporary dumbness, blindness, or paralysis. We shall first give these singular affections every advantage by recording them in Dr. Massie's unctuous periods. That divine must be an invaluable acquisition to tea-tables, now that his mind is stored with a solid system of Ulster old wives' fables. We shall then give a plain, unvarnished statement of that which we have witnessed with our own eyes.

Let us then hear Dr. Massie, and the *Ballymena Observer* :—

'Another new and astonishing phase of the prevailing influence has become developed in the course of the present week in the case of a girl of pious and exemplary character, now thirteen years of age, residing in Ballymena. She was "impressed" for the first time about a month ago, and has since enjoyed great tranquillity of spirit and good ordinary health, subject however to brief attacks of sudden weakness of body, with silent, but evident ecstasy of mind. On Saturday last, while recovering from one of these visitations, it was discovered that she had become totally dumb. Her tongue was paralysed, and though otherwise quite well, she remained without the power of speech. In the course of that day she wrote the following words with a pencil on paper, and gave it to her parents :—"I will recover my speech on Tuesday at four o'clock, and lose it again on Wednesday at ten o'clock; an angel told me so to-day, 2d July, 1859." We visited the girl in her father's house on Tuesday at half-past three. She was then quite well, but speechless. The point of her tongue appeared to be turned downwards; there was a hollow curve along the centre of the entire surface, and it had been examined on the previous day by a respectable physician of the town. About a quarter before four a weakness crept over the poor girl, and in a few minutes she was found to be in a state of nervous stupor. Precisely at four o'clock, and while yet in her apparently unconscious state, she regained the power of speech, and to the astonishment of all present exercised it in an outburst of sacred melody, clear, solemn, and harmonious, and she appeared fully awake before she had concluded singing the first verse. During the rest of the evening she expressed herself as quite happy, talked fluently, and repeatedly prayed. About half an hour before midnight she became instantaneously totally blind. Soon afterwards, while persons were engaged in singing hymns with her, she suddenly exclaimed, "Hush!" She seemed to be listening intently for a moment, and immediately afterwards exclaimed that she had heard a voice which desired her to be comforted, for she would be restored to sight before being again deprived of speech. The prediction was veri-

fied. Her eyes were opened at half-past nine on the following morning, and after another week's interval she became speechless for the second time, precisely at ten o'clock, and remained so till two o'clock in the afternoon of the same day. We shall only add that on every point of reference to the above mysterious occurrences, we have been careful to state nothing but facts—facts well known to hundreds of the population. Who will explain them ?

There are similar accounts from Port Glasgow, to which place the revival is carried from Ireland.

‘These cases of physical prostration are sufficiently solemnising, one would suppose, but phenomena still more marvellous are now appearing. On Tuesday evening, along with the Provost of Port Glasgow, and a number of other persons, I was present with a young woman at the hour which she had before specified as the time when she would recover from her trance, during which she was blind, deaf, and dumb. The persons thus affected describe themselves as being away with Jesus, but they are not usually very communicative as to what they have seen, and probably their visions are not such as could be well described. Their appearance, however, is quite enough to convince every beholder that they are witnessing some glorious vision. The face of one young woman when she “went away” was so radiant with beauty that those who observed her were struck with awe, and one woman actually fainted away. When the vision, trance, or whatever it may be called, began, the eyes of the young woman were fixed on some object which appeared to excite within her adoring wonder, her very features appeared to undergo a change; and a flood of light from above seemed to be poured down upon her. So intent was her gaze upon this glorious object that for half an hour not an eye nor an eyelid moved. They have visions in which heaven and hell are realised in a vivid manner. I would not take it upon me to say that every case of reported trance is genuine, for it is quite possible that the devil may stir up his emissaries to simulate the work of the Holy Spirit.’

Dr. Massie says of other relations somewhat apologetically:—

‘Several cases were named to me which had been accompanied by most unaccountable phenomena, the circumstances were detailed by a sober-minded Christian, who was in daily intercourse with the parties affected. Such cases, however, must stand by themselves.’

The *Ballymena Observer*, speaking of a girl, minutely describes the appearances:—

‘When previously affected, her eyes remained open during the entire time of the visitation, but they were now firmly closed, and with the exception of an occasional gentle movement of the lips, and a tremulous motion of the eyes, clearly perceptible beneath the eyelids, her features were in profound repose. Her pulse was full, and beat with strength and perfect regularity, but considerably slower than it is usually found in children. The heat of her body was natural, and in general she breathed calmly, but there were several momentary intervals in which her respiration became extremely hurried, a fluttering motion being then perceptible about the neck and breast, accompanied by a slight nervous movement of the arms and hands. She was restored to consciousness in about three hours, but for more than an hour afterwards she was unable to move her lips, or articulate a single syllable. Her eyes when first opened did not appear to be cognisant of any object within view, but they subsequently

assumed an expression of tranquil happiness, and when she regained the power of speech she did not, as on the former occasion, describe any scene which had been presented to her imagination during the interval of visitation.'—*The Revival*. By W. M. Wilkinson, pp. 96—108.

To us it also happened to be eye-witnesses of the largest development of this kind of thing which has, perhaps, anywhere occurred. Accompanied by two friends—one the kind and sagacious rector of the parish—we proceeded to witness 'the great work' which was going on in the 'town', let us call it, of Ballymudmud. Our drive, that fine summer morning, lay through a tract especially characteristic of the north of Ireland. As we advanced, we left behind us the blue and restless gleaming of the Atlantic over a long low line of sandhills. Before us were black bogs, stretching to a chain of inconsiderable hills, dotted with loose grey stones. It was a dull and unelevating scene; and the dirty cabins stuck together in groups were just the place in which one would expect to find the festering elements of an epidemic fanaticism. A *cicerone* soon appeared, in the person of a decent elderly man. This individual might have sat for a picture to Walter Scott. His feelings were evidently of a mingled character. There was pride for the glories of Ballymudmud. 'I'll warrant ye'll have come to see the maracles. There'll be plenty 'ull hear of Ballymudmud now.' But as he poured out his marvels, it soon appeared that other thoughts were at work. His shrewd gimlet eye soon *bored* down into our opinion. It came out, point by point, first, that he thought the illuminated rather a nuisance; then, that he did not quite know what to make of it, but had grave suspicions of the whole business. First, he conducted us to a house where we found a brother and sister who had been affected. The boy had had visions of heaven and hell, in the latter of which he had seen various persons, *living* and dead. The girl, a large young woman, with a dark, flushed face, lay upon the bed, speechless, having notified that she was to be dumb for a series of hours. It appeared, however, subsequently, that the rule applied was of the Lesbian character, as permission was accorded to break silence whenever it seemed advisable to do so. Thus, when one of us put some searching questions to the boy, she informed us that 'He said that we were lying too hard upon the chap, 'and that, if we meant to ask him questions, we should have told 'him before, that he might answer them right.' After this, she relapsed into a comatose state. During our stay, a young man came in from a neighbouring parish, with a strange, restless smile upon his features, and a Bible in his hand. We were looking at the girl, and her eyes certainly seemed to be closed; yet it was singular to observe the sort of *rapport* which imme-

diately appeared to be established. No sooner had the 'boy' passed the threshold, than the girl sprang up as if magnetized; a strange smile worked across her face; she grasped his hands violently, and shook them again and again. We were surprised to learn that 'they were not *sib*' (*Anglicè*, relations), and had never met before. We visited two or three more houses, one containing a quiet, interesting-looking girl, who had alternate fits of dumbness, blindness, and paralyzed hand. But the chief exhibition was at a shoemaker's house, where a mother and daughter were 'illuminated.' The daughter's dumbness had passed away just as we arrived. She had been 'struck' *thirty-two* times, and her hand was now hanging, as if useless, in a sling. On feeling it, however, it was perfectly warm and flexible. A more glib and conceited young person we have seldom met; and we cannot recall some of the visions which she described, with a coarse semi-erotic *gusto*, without horror. The attention given to the daughter appeared to displease the mother: she frowned, shook her head, and made signs. These signs, as interpreted by the bystanders, appeared to indicate that the millennium had not yet dawned upon Ballymudmud. It seemed that another female had denounced our friend as a false prophetess, for which she had been made dumb also. Just as we were departing, the mother conveyed to us that her lips were unsealed. She raised up her hand, and said with emphasis, 'Thus saith the Lord, this shall be a sign unto you.' We record the expression, that it may be judged whether it be 'absolutely beyond the natural powers of the human mind.' We should mention, that in all cases Bibles were brought to these persons by their friends. The affected closed their eyes, held them up at arm's length, as if for Divine guidance, opened the book, and handed it to the bystanders. The verse was always received as divinely given, and applicable to existing circumstances. Sceptics like ourselves might suggest that it would be difficult to light upon a passage which would not give some meaning for any situation. But unlucky accidents occurred: the book would sometimes open at an intractable page, and the finger point to a verse in the genealogies in Chronicles, in S. Matthew or S. Luke.

We leave our readers to judge between Dr. Massie and ourselves. If they wish for full satisfaction, let them consult any sensible and well-informed physician. And if they are amazed at the correspondence between the predictions made to persons that they would fall into given states and the result, let them remember this short physiological law, which reflects much light on the Ulster Revival, that *states of the body, conceived to be approaching, and expected with undoubted confidence, will, in most cases within the bounds of possibility,*

and in some which might antecedently appear almost impossible, have a tendency to occur, simply in virtue of such idea.

We have only to add to the account of our pilgrimage, that while we were in Ballymudmud, three Scotch ministers were performing *dulia* to these Presbyterian Addoloratas, and that unctuous articles appeared in at least one local revivalist organ. To us, we must confess that it appeared, on the whole, as if the wretched village would have rather gained than lost by the substitution of ordinary work and amusement for hysterics, indolence, and fanaticism.

We are aware that it may be asked why such things as these are brought forward. Those who think best of them will, it is urged, not go further than to call them, with Mr. Moore, 'the mere drapery of the work, and the effect of its deep and 'intense reality,' while most sensible advocates will admit that they are mere 'excrecences upon the work.' Our answer is, that when the revivalists openly and boldly disclaim Dr. Massie, Mr. Baillie, and Mr. Moore; when they repudiate the mass of silly and extravagant legends which are circulated in tracts and newspapers beyond number; then, and not till then, shall we think it unnecessary to publish the truth. We know something, too, of the so-called *sensible* revivalist party. Those who talk now of their sobriety and freedom from excitement are the same men who were, to our knowledge, in some instances, preaching to immense congregations the delirious ravings of hysterical girls. He who called these things 'excrecences' a few months ago, would have been denounced as a heathen man and a publican by the same persons who borrow the leaves of an assumed moderation to cover the nakedness of their fanaticism.

There was yet another kind of miraculous interposition which was claimed by the Revival agents, though it was felt that it was hardly the kind of thing to present to the English public. We know excellent dissenters who can depose to the fact of their having *heard* Presbyterian ministers state before large congregations, that they had seen luminous appearances sail into meeting-houses, stand out in relief behind the speakers, or move up and down through the people, 'striking' right and left. The Rev. T. Witsitt, of Drum, Monaghan, writes:—

'It was true the report which you heard. At one of our meetings for prayer, at which there were a number of convictions, a dark cloud formed on the ceiling, and, in the course of a few minutes, a number of forms burst out. One, in particular, was of human appearance, which passed and repassed across all the lights, and descended to the pew in which a young woman was rejoicing. The appearance lasted for three minutes or more, produced no terror, but joy, especially among the converts. All present

did not see it. Perhaps three hundred saw it, and can testify to the letter.'

There are certain notorious facts which rather absolve one from the task of investigating these marvels. Professor M'Cosh, in an address delivered before the Evangelical Alliance, has the candour to state, that at a prayer-meeting held by himself, a cry was raised that the light of God's glory was among them. The learned Professor at once brought the matter to an issue by going out and exhibiting the lanthorn, whose reflection on the window, as it was being carried across the yard, originated the report. Mr. M'Ilwaine says:—

'I have heard on entirely reliable authority of a *whole congregation* being deceived into the idea that they beheld the Holy Spirit bodily descending from the ceiling. One person who was present interpreted what they called a "spark of a light" by a butterfly, which he perceived hovering over them, and was pronounced an unbeliever.'

The points, then, which we have so far established, appear to be these: first, that the Revival movement of 1859 in Ulster was progressive, not simultaneous; propagated, not spontaneous; the explosion of a humanly-laid train, not the irradiation of a heavenly lightning; secondly, that the 'physical manifestations,' and claims to miraculous attestations, were not accidental accompaniments, but of the very essence of the whole work.

It is, indeed, constantly maintained, that the second of these propositions is false. We assert, without fear of contradiction, that no district can be pointed out where the movement made the slightest way without the assistance of these phenomena. In truth, the Revivalists have shifted their ground. When the movement commenced, it was asserted from a hundred dissenting, we fear from not a few cathedral and parochial, pulpits, that these 'mysterious bodily affections' were divine. 'We may not like them—they may not be what we should have *à priori* expected or desired,' said the Revivalists, 'but there they are, a patent divine fact.' A little time passed; the common sense of the people began to see through the smoke; 'narves' and 'scar' (*Anglicè*, fright) were freely resorted to as a more rational solution. Physiology came in with unerring utterances. The Rev. E. Metcalfe first broke ground in a most interesting letter to the *Dublin Daily Express*, upon one of the most singular phases of hysteria. Mr. M'Ilwaine, a clergyman of strong Evangelical principles, and one of the most popular preachers in Belfast, with great acuteness and rare moral courage, set his face like a flint, and from his pulpit and with his pen denounced the fearful extravagances which were being perpetrated in the name of religion. Then came Archdeacon Stopford's masterly

pamphlet. The Revivalists denied it as far as they dared. But truth was too strong for them. No one ventured any longer to talk of the unearthly beauty of the faces, or the ringing cry from the tongues of the stricken ones. No one will deny that hysteria was succeeded in some cases by theomania, epilepsy, death. There were two voices in the Revivalist camp. To the public, the dissenting ministers used a mild scientific voice. In private, they went about from house to house roaring in the ears of the people that the 'striking' was the Holy Ghost's work, that they wished every one was stricken, that an individual might possibly be saved without it, but that it added a confirmation to his call.

Once more we ask—Where the Revival movement has made way, without striking and reputed miracles?

But Dr. M'Cosh, who is a philosopher and an elegant writer as well as a Revivalist, has his *rationale* of the physical seizure. It is, he maintains, the natural result of the Irish temperament. Given the same amount of religious impulse and an English nature, and no such extraordinary *phenomena* would ensue. This position he illustrates by his reminiscences of three regiments, English, Scotch, and Irish, parting from their friends and families to sail for the Crimea, and by the different phases which sorrow assumed in the representatives of the three races. With the Scotch there was the bursting tear and the heaving frame; with the English, merely the pale and serious face; with the Irish, the uncontrolled burst of weeping and the wail as of broken hearts. We are afraid that the Professor's hypothesis is more ingenious than solid. Irishmen have surely been awakened, in some cases, to a solemn view of eternal realities before the year of grace 1859. Has Dr. M'Cosh ever heard or seen a case in which they have been thus affected? Again, is it possible that this eminent Presbyterian divine has never read Mr. M'Culloch's account of the awakening at Cambuslang in the last century? He will there find that the Scotch peasantry were seized with symptoms precisely identical with those which were so conspicuous in Belfast and Coleraine. An English friend assured us, that in a village in Berkshire he had witnessed just such cases during a Methodist Revival. But the evidence against Dr. M'Cosh's *rationale* swells in our memory as we write. The convulsions of the Ursulines, familiar to every one as 'Les Diables de Loudun,' are generically similar. The convulsions of S. Médard among the Jansenists, and the choreomania of the *convulsionnaires* as well as of Kentucky, are but modifications of the same fact. The history of the Protestant prophets of the Cevennes is the history of the Ulster Revivalists, except that the latter is *minus* the beautiful frame-

work in which the other is encased. So that this portion of Irish Revivalism cannot be explained into the action of grace upon a peculiar form or variety of human nature. It is produced in an intense degree where Dr. M'Cosh would not for a moment admit that grace was at work in the lowest degree. In truth, it is the *disease* of human nature—whether it call itself Jansenist or Calvinist, Catholic or Protestant—when the salutary empire of reason is abdicated; when the barriers which the Church has reared against the terrors of the unseen world are torn down by fanaticism; and epidemic hysteria simulates the action of faith, hope, and charity, by morbid imitations, which resemble those heavenly graces in about the same degree that the contortions of a chimpanzee resemble the gestures of a man.

There is a curious fact, which should be mentioned here, and which also militates against Dr. M'Cosh's theory. According to him, these physical seizures were the concomitant or consequent of mental emotion, modified by national idiosyncrasies. Yet, in a vast number of cases, so far as we have read or observed, such affections, at least when they became prevalent in a district, were *antecedent* to the mental emotion. We know of persons who have undergone the physical affection in the most tremendous degree without the slightest religious association. We know of others who underwent the 'striking' *without* previous thought, but who professed in consequence of it to have experienced a spiritual improvement. The *Ballymena Observer* tells us of 'a child, only seven years of age, who without the slightest previous agitation, or uneasiness of manner, 'was struck prostrate in a single moment.' The same paper speaks of another girl, who was stricken into a cataleptic or somnambule trance while busy preparing for her daily exercises at school.

We venture to think that no *rationale* of the Revival which we have seen is quite logically self-consistent—or a correct inference from the premises assumed. The theories of which we know may be reduced to one or other of *three* divisions. Some, with Archdeacon Stopford and Mr. M'Ilwaine, consider that there is a real and divine element at work, marred and 'counter-worked' by hysteria, and other results of human or diabolical agency. Some again, with Mr. Gwynne, consider that the whole *substratum* of the work is heavenly. They think that a divine impulse is projected into our humanity; but that that which is directly divine ceases with the projection, and is then left to work its way according to psychological laws, refracted, it may be marred, by the nature of our organization, by individual peculiarities, by an incapacity in the earthen vessel to receive

the treasure. Hence hysteria, epilepsy, and similar affections, are the accidental result of a divine awakening, according to the natural and unsuspended laws arising from the *doctrina federis*. Finally, a third class, with Dr. Carson of Coleraine, and Mr. W. M. Wilkinson, boldly take up the physical affections, and argue from them. Dr. Carson's view of the final cause of these manifestations is curiously like that which was advanced by a champion of the Jansenist *convulsionnaires*. 'This spectacle,' wrote Léauté about 1739, 'which strikes both our eyes and ears, is intended to give us some salutary lessons in this time of rebuke and scandal, in discovering to us the judgments of divine wrath, in recalling to our memory the compassions and promises pledged to the Church. The *convulsionnaires* are the instruments employed for this purpose. They are breathing, moving, speaking pictures. They are trumpets which warn us to take heed.' Singularly analogous is the view taken by Dr. Carson, writing from Coleraine in 1859, in reference to the northern *convulsionnaires*. These exhibitions, he maintains, effect an end which could be gained by no other agency. Suppose half of Coleraine to have been converted in silence and quiet; the other half, Dr. Carson maintains, would be utterly incredulous. But these 'striking' forced themselves upon public observation. They would not be gainsaid. Hence he insists that a physical agent was at work as well as a spiritual. And this he proves most satisfactorily, especially from the fact, which we also had observed long before we read Dr. Carson's pamphlet, that the Revival spread from place to place, and was almost entirely propagated by those persons who had themselves been 'stricken.' But when Dr. Carson came to treat upon this physical agent, he certainly left himself open to Mr. Gwynne's penetration and learning. He said, and said truly, that hysteria, so far as it is ordinarily known to medical men, or met with in medical dictionaries, did not explain many of the *phenomena*; and fell into that most fallacious kind of general conclusion from particular premises, that what was unknown to him and to family medicine-books, was unknown in the abstract. But Mr. Gwynne overwhelms the Doctor with citations from Hecker, and other authorities; reminds him that the question is not of simple hysteria but of epidemic, epileptiform disease, and nervous maladies communicated by imitation; and mercilessly taunts him with ignorance. Mr. Wilkinson, writing from a *spiritualist* point of view (we are bound to say with great ability), takes up another class of phenomena—the somnambulist, mesmeric, biological, magnetic, or by whatever name it may be right to call them—and the visions seen by those who were in this state. These parties,

he argues, were placed by magnetic influence in a *mediumistic* state, and thus directly brought into contact with the world unseen.

Each of these three classes of views is important. It is by striking off something from each, and supplementing it by the others, that we shall arrive at the truth.

In the main, we quite agree with Archdeacon Stopford and Mr. M'Ilwaine. To those gentlemen the public owe a debt of gratitude for the manliness with which they faced obloquy; and in the case of Mr. M'Ilwaine, we presume, overcame antecedent prejudices in favour of an opposite conclusion; but we are unable to see how, if a special and unusual 'work' of grace were really going on, it could possibly be dissevered from that which the Archdeacon terms the 'counterwork.' It must be admitted, that in most cases, *without the 'counterwork,' there was no 'work.'* And in those individuals whose subsequent career has proved most satisfactory, we apprehend that, in a majority of instances, the impulse took precisely that form which appears to these able writers so objectionable.

On the other hand, we thoroughly agree with the Archdeacon and the Incumbent of S. George's, that hysteria is a form in which it is horrible to trace the course of God's Holy Spirit, because hysteria is an unholy disease, selfish, morbid—and *worse!* And the Revival visions are quite explained by Dr. Stopford's pithy sentence—'the visions and revelations are due to hysterical suppression of the powers of will and reason, leaving the 'operations of the cerebrum and sensorium as uncontrolled as in 'dreams.'¹ Mr. Wilkinson is indignant with this. He maintains that it would annihilate S. Paul's conversion, the accompanying vision of the Lord by Ananias, the visions of Cornelius and S. Peter, and that most divine vision of S. John, which the universal Church receives as the Book of Revelation. 'What,' asks Mr. Wilkinson, 'would the Archdeacon reply, if the persons were to say to him, these visions and revelations are due 'to hysterical suppressions of the powers of will and reason?'

¹ Roman Catholic authorities, who have much experience in this kind of thing, are generally rather slow in endorsing visions. We have heard of a nun, celebrated for her trances, who described them to an English Roman Catholic Bishop of the old school. His answer was, 'Very sweet, very heavenly!—*take a blue pill, ma'am!*'—Dr. Newman would be more sceptical in relation to *stigmata* than the thousands of Presbyterians who visited the Lisburn girls, with tattooed breasts. 'In the Convent of the Perpetual Adoration, or the poor Clares, that sight has acted otherwise on the mind of a weak sister. The very keenness of her faith and wild desire of approaching it, has led her to fancy or to feign that she has received that singular favour; she points to God's wounds, as imprinted on her hands and feet, and side, though she herself has been instrumental in their formation.'—*Anglican Difficulties*, p. 237.

But, be it remarked, that there is in Scripture, generally speaking, an *objective* framework to hold together these visions, and to discriminate them from *subjective* infirmity. These ultra-Protestant wonders are thin and bodiless. They want a factual element to give them substance. They are dashed to pieces against any objective test. This is the weak point of the Camisard marvels. There is much of a subjective kind that is truly amazing; but the prophets venture on giving a year for the downfall of Popery in France, and they are wrong. They assert that their bodies are bullet-proof, and they fall riddled with balls. The incombustibility of Clary is asserted in the *Théâtre sacré des Cévennes*. Edward Irving makes much of this, but he forgets to quote the significant note of honest Court, the Camisard brigadier:—‘This event made a great noise; it is attested in substance by a great number of witnesses; but, from information taken on the spot, the truth is altered. 1st. Clary did not remain in the fire. 2dly. He entered it twice. 3dly. His neck and arms were burnt, and he was obliged to remain at Pierredou to be cured. Brigadier Montbounoux, Clary’s intimate friend, confirms this; but he is sure that the fire, and the time during which he was in it, would have caused him to be worse scorched if there had not been something marvellous in it.’ With all deference, then, to Mr. Wilkinson, we shall wield Occam’s razor, *entia non esse multiplicanda*; we shall not assume a Divine communication where a human imbecility will account for all the phenomena.

We quite agree with Mr. M’Ilwaine, when he says, ‘There has been extensively prevalent a nervous malady of an exceedingly infectious and epidemic nature. Its forms are various. If any person wishes to obtain full information as well as extremely valuable suggestions on one of its forms at least, let him consult the seasonable pamphlet which has just appeared from the pen of Archdeacon Stopford. I am strongly of opinion that other physical influences have been, and still are, extensively in operation. Most persons are acquainted with the mesmeric, or biological influence. I have met cases myself.’ (*Revivalism Reviewed*, p. 9.) This has long been our opinion also. A power appears to have been exercised by certain individuals of producing ‘cases’ in a remarkable degree. Sometimes many ‘fell’ under persons who have since turned out to be eminently unholy. Mr. Wilkinson’s singular views, and the peculiar line which his investigations have taken, as well as his profound knowledge on these subjects, make him a valuable witness. He cites Dr. Carson’s assertion, that ‘the most illiterate convert who had himself been physically affected, had far more power in producing manifestations in the audience than the most eloquent

'and touching speaker who could address them,' as a great magnetic fact. He describes the physical agent as almost a magnetically manufactured affection in its more violent form. Still further; precisely the same type of thought permeates all the persons affected. The visions are nearly all cast in the same mould. The very expressions are strangely similar. This arises from the proved psychological law of the transmission and insertion of thought—of the magnetic influence of psychological transmission, or mental transfer, so that multitudes become permeated or psychologized with the same forms of thought. Were a Mahomedan or Roman Catholic Revival to arise, the forms of thought would be Tridentine and Mahomedan. This derives remarkable confirmation from the Bishop of Skara's letters to the Archbishop of Upsala on the Revival, or 'preaching sickness,' in Sweden, in 1842. The Bishop writes, that he soon formed the opinion that the disease corresponded very much with what he had read of animal magnetism in Kluge's book, and that he had carefully studied the effects of sulphur and the magnet. Many of the persons affected were actually cured by medicines administered by the Bishop. Much of this is but the scientific statement of that as a law which has always been known as a fact. It was in great degree an implicit acquaintance with psychological transmission which made the ancient Church so keenly alive to the danger arising from being present at heretical or schismatical worship. We find it popularly stated in this vivid sentence from the elegant but unbelieving Shaftesbury. 'No wonder 'if the blaze rises so of a sudden, when innumerable eyes glow 'with the passion, and heaving breasts are labouring with inspiration; when not the aspect only, but the very breath and 'exhalations of men are infectious, and the inspiring disease 'imparts itself by insensible transpiration.'¹

In reference to the physical affections, it may not be uninteresting to quote from some books which we have studied in reference to the Jansenist *convulsionnaires* and the prophets of the Cévennes. In 1733, Hecquet, a physician, wrote a work, entitled, '*Naturalisme de Convulsion démontré.*' He shows that such phenomena have their origin in an affection which is not uncommon among women and persons of a quick imagination. He proves, by illustrations, that the instinctive desire of experiencing extraordinary effects, of which we have heard or seen, has a tendency to make us believe that we experience them, and, in some cases, actually to experience them. Man's nature is essentially and intensely sympathetic. He also establishes the communication of nervous maladies by imitation.

¹ Letter concerning Enthusiasm, Works, vol. i. p. 38.

Let us add some sentences from M. Figuiet's explanatory essay on the phenomena of so-called prophetic inspiration among the Protestant mountaineers. 'The ecstatic illumination of the Cévenols, which Catholic writers attribute to the devil, Protestants to the direct intervention of the Holy Spirit, was, in our judgment, the result of a pathological affection seated whether in the brain or other nervous centres. Essentially epidemic in its nature, this affection, pushed to an extreme, might have superinduced madness; but in the great majority of cases it culminated only in intermittent attacks, which, except in their crisis, but feebly altered the health or intelligence of the individual. M. Calmeil, in his work on "Madness," concludes by referring the ecstatic theomania of the Calvinists to hysteria in the simpler cases, to epilepsy in the graver. "We may not be able to classify the state of the Cévenols precisely under any affection in our nosological list; it was, we think, an affection *sui generis*, of a special nature like the causes which produced it. After preaching, or some other circumstance which directed his mind to religious ideas, the individual became a prey to a lively cerebral exaltation. After more or less of this mental absorption, he suddenly fell over without feeling. Stretched upon the ground, he was seized with an epileptiform access. His body trembled violently; his muscles were convulsively agitated. The convulsive agitations at last disappeared; quiet and serenity succeeded trembling and horror. Let us add, that a whole assembly, often composed of a thousand persons, might fall suddenly over, a prey to ecstatic convulsions, solely upon the imperious command of a prophet. The children who 'fell,' to use the expression yet common in the Cévennes, were generally ten or twelve. The epidemic or contagious character of the sickness of the Shakers of the Cévennes should be remarked. The Marshal de Villars, an eye-witness, wrote:—"I have seen an entire village, whose women and girls, without an exception, appeared to be possessed of the devil." We have already remarked, that this epidemic affection was reduced in most cases to accesses recurring at intervals, as attacks of hysteria or epilepsy, which did not sensibly alter the general health of the individual, but, pushed a little further, might have ended in madness. Excess of persecution began the movement. Despair exalted the cerebrum, and delirium, an epileptiform affection, was added to it. It has great analogies with the affections of the Jansenist *convulsionnaires*. The same exterior and interior characters dominate in these two psychico-moral epidemics. Agitation, more or less violent, ecstasies, sudden falls, convulsive contortions, physical insensibility momentarily superinduced, here are symptoms equally to be

'detected in the cemetery of S. Médard as in the wilds of the Cévennes.'¹

As we have said, we are unable to agree *precisely* with any of the theories advanced. Those of Archdeacon Stopford and Mr. M'Ilwaine appear to be infinitely nearer the truth than the others. Probably Mr. Oulton (whose admirable pamphlet we strongly recommend) would range himself on our side. The conclusion of the existence of *work* and *counterwork* is, we think, illogical; because, in truth, that which the Archdeacon calls the *counterwork* is the *work*. Without the counterwork there would have been no work. The two things are more inseparable than light and heat. We agree again with Dr. Carson, that there was a physical agent at work, more subtle and extensive than hysteria. But we conceive that of hysteria he was very ignorant, that he vastly understated its amount, and that Archdeacon Stopford's masterly essay has set that part of the question at rest for ever. This physical agent, which Dr.

¹ *Histoire du Merveilleux*, par Louis Figuier, tom. ii. pp. 391—420. (Paris, L. Hachette. 1860.)

The subsequent history of these persecuted Protestants has not been traced by M. Figuier. It bears upon two curious chapters in human nature, Revivalism and Spiritualism. Shaftesbury, in his letter on Enthusiasm, tells us that these strange persons continued to exhibit these phenomena in London. Their 'strange voices and involuntary agitations' were caricatured in a puppet-show at Bartlemy-fair. This was in 1707. One of them, Cavalier, became a major-general in the British army, and Governor of Jersey. Edward Irving, in the *Morning Watch*, has a curious story of Queen Anne's asking him if he were still visited with ecstasies, and of his hanging his head, and weeping bitterly. Many of them found their way to America, and became the founders of the Shakers. This body anticipated the Methodists and Presbyterians in Revivals. It was during a long Revival of seven years that Spiritualism first came to light. The Spiritualists still look with affectionate reverence to this rock whence they were hewn. Mr. Harris, an extraordinary, and certainly very powerful American preacher, now in London, and who is said to utter his discourses in a *mediumistic* state—observes in a recently published sermon:—'I solemnly affirm, that, from the best of my knowledge, results have been produced, through a heavenly spiritualism, in the last seven years, equal in quality, though not in quantity, to the best results from the labours of Whitfield or the Wesleys, of Oberlin or of the early Friends. Since the "great tide-wave of Revivalism, harmonizing with the best of the two contending influences in Spiritualism, has begun to flow (and the Revival movement is all a spiritual phenomenon, though not the work of individual spirits in its inception, but of Almighty God) we may doubtless expect an extension of its startling but elevating results.' The ablest Spiritualists have appeared as zealous labourers in the Revival field. Mr. William Howitt has written a translation of Ennemoser's work, and an essay on the prophets of the Cévennes. Mrs. Howitt has appended an account of the preaching sickness in Sweden to her husband's book. Mr. Wilkinson's work on the Ulster Revival is its most elaborate history. We are promised an article in the next *Spiritual Magazine* upon the 'Revival on the Continent.' We refer to the *Spiritual Magazine*, No. 2, February, 1860 (London: F. Pitman, 20, Paternoster Row) for an article on Spiritualism among the Shakers, to prove the *rapport* between the two movements. We will only say, that Dr. Maitland's authority, and certain facts within our knowledge, lead us to suspect that the hint contained in this note may be useful, and that the facts which it contains may yet come forward into a startling prominence.

Carson shrouds in mystery, and pronounces to be undiscoverable by physiological science, guided by the researches of the Swedish Bishop, and fortified by the arguments of Mr. Wilkinson, as well as by the accounts of some most sagacious observers—we identify with animal magnetism. For the position, however, that the trances, visions, and so forth, were direct communications with spirits, good or bad, we must request to be left to the liberty of a suspended speculation. If we were required to answer the question—Is the Revival a movement essentially good, distorted to evil, or a movement essentially evil, overruled to good?—we might shrink from the responsibility involved in such an act of judgment, as a categorical response would imply. But putting together all that we have read or heard, we cannot avoid coming to such a conclusion as this. Magnetism and hysteria were the principal agents at work. But if magnetism and hysteria be physiologically human, and not divine, then the movement, on the whole, is human, not divine. But are we to conclude that the Divine and Blessed Spirit, the Comforter, was altogether absent, or that He withheld his blessing from those who sought Him, earnestly and in faith, though it may be blindly and fanatically? Surely not. In our judgment, the revival of 1859 was an agitation originated by palpable human instrumentality;¹ forwarded and impelled by magnetic laws of psychological transmission—such as are at work wherever a large mass, so to speak, of excited affection is generated—by morbid imitation, by the contagiousness of emotion, by the tendency of our nature upon a small stock of passion to stimulate itself into more, and by the prevalence of epidemic hysterical or epileptiform disease; graciously overruled by God's most Holy Spirit to the good of those who were led to seek His influences in humble prayer, with penitential sorrow.

We understand that some of our prelates are about to introduce into their course for ordination candidates a list of revival works, and especially some bearing on the times of Wesley. We think it only right that such a course should be supplemented by one of Hecker, Stopford, Feuerbach, Laycock, and Calmeil.

We are painfully sensible that we have written some things calculated to wound or offend persons whose feelings we should be sorry to hurt. We also labour under the disadvantage of seeming to speak lightly of deep religious feeling. We must say, in excuse, that at the present crisis it is necessary to tell the exact truth. For our part, we fully agree with two great men

¹ Superstitio—quæ verè nihil aliud quàm *Panicus terror* est.—Bacon, *De Augment. Scient.* lib. ii. c. 13.

who had studied the nature of religious enthusiasm most profoundly. Mr. Alexander Knox writes piously and wisely:—

‘I regret that Mr. Southey seems to take wayward pleasure in showing off the annoying spectacles of fermentitious religion. There is a lightness in his expressions which may lead his readers to confound the substance of religion with those abuses of it. It is the profoundly pious and thoroughly well-informed Christian alone, who can draw the line accurately between intelligible religious affection, and unintelligible religious insanity. No topic is more difficult, or more delicate, than that of religious enthusiasm. In order to understand it, we should need a deeper insight into both corporeal and mental physiology. We should probably perceive that human nature, by its very construction, is liable to be agitated by nothing so much as by an apprehension of the great facts of religion. He who speaks under the influence of such an apprehension, will naturally excite in susceptible hearers a sympathy with what he himself feels; and if (instead of imitating the living Wisdom from above, who taught “as men were able to bear it,”) he sets himself to excite the strongest possible terrors and joys, discarding reason in himself, and trampling it down in his hearers, it is impossible to limit the pitch to which religious agitation may be carried both in mind and body. Temporary, or even lasting madness, swoons, convulsions, catalepsies, everything which is terrific or revolting, in intellect or frame, may be justly dreaded. On these principles, I conceive, we might account for most of the phenomena which attended commencing Methodism. Mr. Southey sees them pretty much in the same light, and his strictures might have been useful had they been in the spirit of a Christian philosopher, rather than in that of a Lucian or a Conyers Middleton.’¹

This long extract is justified by its tone of sedate and impartial wisdom. We will close this portion of our task by venturing to express our own feelings in the glowing language of Henry More:—

‘The devotional enthusiasm of holy and sincere souls,’ says the great Cambridge Platonist, ‘has not at all been taxed in all this discourse. There has not one word all this time been spoken against that true and warrantable enthusiasm of devout and holy souls, who are so strangely transported in that vehement love they bear towards God, and that unexhaustible joy and peace they find in Him. For they are modest enough and sober in all this, they witnessing no other thing to the world than what others may experience in themselves, and what is plainly set down in the Holy Scriptures, that the kingdom of God is righteousness, and peace, and joy in the Holy Ghost—to such enthusiasm as this, which is but the triumph of the soul of man inebriated, as it were, with that delicious sense of the divine life, I must declare myself as much a friend, as I am to the vulgar fanatical enthusiasm a profound enemy.’²

God forbid, that in the recoil from revivalistic extravagances, the orthodox teachers of the faith, should, as Bishop Butler so forcibly expresses it, ‘get into the contrary extreme, under the ‘notion of a reasonable religion; so very reasonable as to have ‘nothing to do with the heart and affections.’³

¹ Remains of A. Knox. Letter to Mrs. Hannah More. Vol. iii. p. 466.

² Dr. H. More's Philosophical Works. A Brief Discourse of Enthusiasm. P. 45.

³ Sermon XIII. Upon the Love of God.

II. The results of the revival in Ulster will naturally be investigated with anxiety. Its *moral* results are perhaps difficult to ascertain. Exaggeration is rife, and facts hard to ascertain, and harder to apply. The testimony of Judge Pigott, a Roman Catholic, at Downpatrick, several months ago, to the moral improvement there, is exceedingly weighty, if the improvement has continued. Mr. Armstrong, the assistant barrister at Coleraine, pronounced a high eulogium upon the movement, and attributed to it the light state of the calendar, which only contained one case. This evidence, however, hardly tells for the revival, as we have ascertained that the assize *previous* to the Revival was maiden. The state of Belfast does not appear to have been ameliorated on the whole. It is evident that the revivalist accounts *must be* grossly exaggerated. Scores of those statements asserted that 'great fear had fallen on every soul,' and that vice was annihilated. Yet it is certain that, whatever may have occurred in isolated cases, whatever single cupfuls may have been cleared, or filtered, by the agitation, the great body of vice still kept on in a volume as broad as ever, dark and foetid as its own odious Blackwater. A clergyman of the Church of England, in making a professedly revivalist speech, was obliged to admit that the Mayor of Belfast had informed him that the committals and convictions never diminished, but rather increased. This the speaker accounted for upon the hypothesis of a preternatural development of police sagacity. We can answer for it that each Belfast newspaper's police sheet on Monday morning contains at least *twenty* Sunday cases, a good proportion with the most unmistakeably Presbyterian names. We are indebted to Mr. Oulton for the following extract from the *Northern Whig* :—

'In the months of January, February, March, and April, 1858, the number of persons brought before the magistrates amounted to 2,890, while in the same four months of the present year—those immediately preceding the Revival mania—they amounted to 2,761 cases, being a falling off of 129. In May commenced the revivals, overrunning the country with their infectious violence up till the present time; and let us now see how far they have been promotive of peace, social well-being, and a healthy tone of morality. In the four months from May to August, 1858, the number of prisoners brought before the magistrates of Belfast amounted to 3,457; while, in the same four months of this year, the number of parties, male and female, sentenced to punishment for being "drunk and disorderly," ran up to the goodly sum total of 3,939, being an increase of no fewer than 482 offenders against God and man in the months during which the "religious manifestations" were in their full swing! Is not this a striking, a most suggestive fact? Night after night are places of worship filled with young men and women, preached to, thundered at, frightened out of their senses by threats of eternal condemnation and lurid visions of a place of torment; and night after night is our police office, as a sort of compensatory retribution, crowded with "drunk and dis-

orderly" inmates. We suggest nothing, we affirm nothing, we leave these statements to produce what impressions they may. The present figures are beyond contradiction; let them stand for whatever they are worth; let them be contradicted if they can. There is one view of the extraordinary increase of criminal offenders in the four months last past that should not be overlooked. It may be recollected that in May and June of 1858 occurred the desperate street riots which for so long a period disgraced our town and consigned a more than usual number of individuals to prison; and yet, in despite of this, we find that in the month of June of this wonderful year of grace, there were brought before the magistrates 79 persons more than in the same turbulent and alarming four weeks of 1858. The fact is, that just now the police accommodation is insufficient for the numbers brought in every night, and especially on Sunday nights. On Monday, the 19th instant, 50 persons, male and female, were on view of the magistrates in the Court-house for being "drunk and disorderly;" and yesterday a further allotment of 48 filled the prison dock to repletion! The numbers are weekly increasing, and yet we are told that Belfast is becoming a very Eden of innocence—a temple wherein morality, and godliness, and household amenities are enthroned and honoured. But we see no proofs of these things—we firmly believe none can be found. We have shown, by unquestionable returns, that the Sabbath-day is now more desecrated than it has been for years—that drunkenness and uncleanness of every description are on the increase; that immorality of a revolting nature is to be seen nightly in our streets. We believe that the same may be said of crime throughout the country—not merely in some of its rural districts, but in the very localities where these Revivals first sprang up, and are now culminating into the most absurd extravagances and the most melancholy delusions. At another time we shall take up this portion of the subject. Sufficient now is it for us to exhibit what they have done for Belfast; to what extent they have improved the *morale* of the people; and how far they can be relied on as safe *indices* of the mental and moral condition of our population. Let the projectors and abettors of this movement show us some tangible, practical results of their labours; let them give us names, dates, and localities; point out to us the public-houses closed, the drunkards reclaimed, the parents reformed, the homes regenerated; but, in the meantime, we shall hold up these criminal statistics before them, and challenge them to refute or explain them if they can.'

It is only right to observe that the *Northern Whig*¹ is professedly opposed to the Revival, and supposed to be Unitarian in its leanings. We believe, however, that these statistics are undeniable. But Mr. M'Ilwaine is a witness beyond suspicion, and this is his testimony:—

'My individual experience, living as I do in its very centre, is, that while vice has been checked to a certain extent—and for which all who love Christian morality feel deeply thankful—this very alleged extent has been most thoroughly exaggerated, and that there is, moreover, an extreme danger of a very grievous reaction setting in. Just to give an example or two, the Revival journals boast of *drinking* habits being all but exterminated, and of public-houses innumerable being closed. I have ascertained that no single public-house, in this entire town, has been

¹ From the same Journal of March 26, we find that the cases of dumbness at Belfast Police Court for the 'Revival Months' of June, July, August, September and October of 1859, are 1,411 against 1,029 for the corresponding months of 1858.

from these alleged causes closed during the past twelve months. It was stated that *nine* unhappy women were "struck" and converted during the course of one day, and had left their wretched occupation. I made inquiry immediately afterwards, and found that from some of the prevalent causes it was a fact that several of these poor creatures, I believe nine, had taken temporary refuge in the union workhouse; but I also ascertained, that in a very few days they every one of them returned to their abandoned habits.'—*Journal of Mental Science*, January, 1860, p. 197.

In reference to prostitutes, we fear that the Revival movement has done little. We apprehend that the despised Church system at Clewer or Wantage has, by the grace and mercy of Almighty God, effected fifty per cent. more of real and abiding good than the entire so-called 'Irish Pentecost.' We have read in one of Dr. Massie's legendary stories an account of a prostitute, not simply converted, but rejoicing and instructing a moral, though not yet regenerated sister. Will he be kind enough to tell the public whether this was one of some Ballymena street-walkers who were forwarded as miracles of grace to a penitentiary in Dublin, under the pastoral care of an eminent Evangelical minister of the Church, but whom in a few days even the loving and gentle heart of that good man was obliged to send out, as likely to corrupt every inmate of the house, and incorrigibly wicked? The Revival sent ten wretched creatures to a penitentiary with which we are acquainted; not one has remained. God forbid that we should exult in these miserable facts, and forgive us, for His mercy's sake, if one inference which dishonours His infinite love and tenderness can be drawn from our statement. But when we are told of a new dispensation; of an agency surpassing that which He set up on the day of Pentecost, and superseding the Holy Catholic and Apostolic Church, we are bound to apply every legitimate test. Our own personal inquiries, in reference to drinking, confirm Mr. McIlwaine's witness in every particular. The clergyman of a large northern town told us that he was informed by the chief spirit-retailer in the place that his trade had decidedly fallen off for some months, but that it was now better than ever. Another clergyman told us that drinking was extinguished in a certain considerable village in his parish. We made the statement to a neighbouring magistrate. His answer was:—'The population is 750. In May, there were 'fourteen whiskey houses licensed by us. The Revival here 'began in July. This is November. There are now fifteen 'public-houses!'

If the improvement in morality be so wonderful, we would ask these good Protestants one question. 'You say that vice 'is annihilated. The Roman Catholics are the majority of the 'population; hence all the vice was monopolised by you, the

'minority—the virtuous and intelligent men of Ulster. It requires, it would seem, a new Pentecost to place you on 'a level with the normal state of the Papists.'

But we do not wish to impale our friends on this awkward dilemma. We do not believe that vice is annihilated; but we do believe that for several years past a considerable change for the better has been at work in the habits of the people. We are also quite sure that isolated cases of reformation succeeded the Revival movement, and that the agitation, when wisely and tenderly guided, lost very much that was objectionable, and wore a more engaging aspect. We have heard much that is pleasing from quiet country places; and we have been told that the loud, stubborn, drunken 'lappers' of the bleaching-greens have in some localities grown quiet, orderly, and tractable. Still the question remains which Mr. M'Ilwaine has put—Is it one kind of excitement supplanting another, the *substratum* of character remaining unchanged? Time only will tell.

Spiritual results are yet more delicate and difficult to gauge.¹ A great impulse to attendance at church and communion was given in some parishes, in others the stream ran altogether in a sectarian direction. We think that this is passing away, and that, on the whole, places of worship are not much better filled than before. Prayer-meetings are held in many places by the people themselves.² With our knowledge of the country, we should much prefer to find family worship established. The Irish are proud of their eloquence, and motives connected more closely with vanity than with devotion will bring our Irish farmer or peasant to an assembly where he can exercise his gifts. If talk, or the use of certain phrases, be the test of change of heart, the movement is overwhelmingly good; if it be those graces and virtues, which, as Professor Blunt used to say, 'wear well,' large deductions must be made.

And here again we are not concerned, in the recoil from the wild exaggerations which have gone round the world, to deny or undervalue any real good which may have been effected, spiritual or moral. Every fragment of truth is Divine. Christian fanaticism is still Christian; and in its lowest degradation never sinks to the level of bacchanalian frenzy.³ That which a

¹ Mr. J. Llewelyn Davies, in his temperate and sensible paper in the last Number of 'Macmillan's Magazine,' assumes too sweepingly a vast increase of spiritual life in Ireland.

² In one parish, where the excitement was most intense, we have just learned that *five* is now the average attendance at a prayer-meeting held once a week. A few months ago, several hundreds crowded the same place night after night. An anti-Revivalist clergyman close by holds *his* prayer-meetings, in the shape of church service, twice a week. He began with 60 at one and 25 at the other, to 300 at the meeting-house; but he numbers now 40 and 20 to—5!

³ See the description of this odious form of fanaticism, *Liv. Hist.* xxxix. c. 13 sqq.

great French poet has said of the less beautiful species of the animal creation may be applied to Christian sects:—

‘Pas de monstre chétif, louche, impur, chassieux,
Qui n’ait l’immensité des astres dans les yeux.’

The northern Irish are chiefly Presbyterians. It is impossible to study the Westminster Confession without seeing that immense masses of Catholic truth are embedded in it. But their system was dull and dead. They went to ‘hear sermon on Sabbath.’ But they had no worship; and the sweet continuous flow of sacramental life did not run through the branches of their vine. There was little belief in the communion of saints. The Holy Communion was at most a sermon.¹ There was much vice and secret sin festering under the whitened sepulchre of a Calvinistic profession. This strange, sweeping movement spoke of death, judgment, heaven, and hell. The wildest fanatic who cried out, ‘Behold the Lamb of God!’ was hurling a weapon of God’s own armoury—was giving forth, with unauthorised lips indeed, the sweetest and most sacred part of the Church’s message. If St. Augustine declared that miracles were wrought in prayer at the shrines of heretical saints, because of the faith of them who prayed, why need we doubt that Scripture texts, uttered by raw converts and wild laymen, might be blessed to simple and believing souls?

Many speakers and writers have ventured to assert that ‘none,’ or ‘very few,’ of those who have been affected have fallen away. The time has not been long; but even now we know that truth must meet such statements with a sorrowful and emphatic denial. Not merely individuals, but some who were conspicuous as preachers and teachers, and eminently successful in producing the physical phenomena, have lapsed into profligacy. We have already spoken of the prostitutes who were paraded as converts a few months ago. We may mention a remarkable instance, as illustrative of the incredible folly of those teachers, upon whose evidence revivalism is to be accepted in the lump, and to displace the beggarly elements of our existing system. There was a certain soldier in a militia regiment quartered in a considerable northern city. This wretched man’s character was of the most infamous description. He was a drunkard. He abandoned his wife, and was constantly to be seen walking about with disreputable women. One evening, coming out of a public-house half intoxicated, he saw a crowd collected round a Revival preacher, and joined the throng.

¹ Chalmers—a name never to be mentioned without respect—seems scarcely to have risen beyond this:—‘I would recommend to you as an excellent subject for a sermon the moral lesson that might be drawn from baptism.’ And of the Lord’s Supper—‘It is a sermon by actions, and a most impressive sermon.’—*Prelections*, pp. 392–400.

After a few minutes he fell as if shot. His face turned pale. A cold sweat bedewed his hair and forehead. He lay insensible for several hours. Then came vehement prayers, and finally peace. Without any further test, without the delay of so much as a few weeks, this miserable man, reeking with the fumes of liquor, with a moral and spiritual nature embruted by promiscuous adultery, was employed to pray and to preach. The thing was not done in a corner. It was not the act of a single raging fanatic. The Presbyterian ministers for miles round vied with each other in securing Mr. —'s services. Sunday after Sunday their cars drove in to bear this military evangelist in triumph to their meeting-houses. He was not, indeed, permitted to ascend the topmost Pisgah of their pulpits, his ascent being limited to the pulpit-stairs. But from thence he held forth to immense audiences in half a dozen meeting-houses. And among those who thus introduced him to their congregations was one gentleman of the highest eminence in his denomination, and whom we should have supposed the very embodiment of good sense. This machinery was, in a certain sense, effective. We have reason to know that 'the preaching soldier' produced the first 'case' in one parish where the people for a long time were unimpressible. The wretched man has relapsed into his old habits with double recklessness. We are acquainted with another parish, also, where the movement grew to an incredible excess. It was introduced by a 'convicted' drunkard, who is now tenfold more the child of perdition than before. Once more, we are sorry to record these miserable details. We do so as a painful duty, and in the interest of *truth*. In answer to the assertion that this so-called 'new dispensation' strikes out at a heat hundreds and thousands of Christians, and those more firm and grounded than most whom God has called in his Church, we reply by a simple denial of the fact. Whatever the blessings or peculiar benefits of the Ulster Revival may be, it is plain matter-of-fact that this is not one of them. It is written in large letters upon the face of society. It is perfectly notorious that many who were not only 'cases' but producers of 'cases,' are now living in the gall of bitterness and the bond of iniquity. We leave it to the scholastic theology of revivalism to solve this by the distinction between 'conviction' and 'conversion;' though if all who 'fell' were claimed as 'sinners saved' at the time, and claimed they were, we think the distinction a little Jesuitical. But this we will say:—If any man was a 'case,' this soldier (and there were many like him) was one. He received that, corporeally and mentally, which hundreds in England are now desiring to be received by themselves and by their countrymen. In striking he was fearful, in convulsions intense, in professions of con-

viction and of peace vehement, in prayer fluent and fervid. To us such instances as these suggest a grave suspicion of the whole, and teach us what fearful deductions must be made from the statistics brought forward by the Chamberlain of London and other sanguine personages.

The 'truth of the doctrine' expressed by the Revival converts is triumphantly alleged in some quarters.¹ Mr. M'Ilwaine, an earnest clergyman of Evangelical principles, and who seems able, by some process which we cannot quite understand, to reconcile a strong attachment to his own Church with adhesion to the Evangelical Alliance, tells us that he has distinctly traced the pullulating embryo of a sect rivalling Mormonism in its worst features. Let us, however, suppose these facts, and others mentioned by Dr. Hincks—*clarum et venerabile nomen*—to be purely local and exceptional. But just read such a passage as this from Mr. Moore's tract. The fourteenth characteristic of the Revival, according to this gentleman, is—

'The doctrine of sovereign, *invincible* grace practically demonstrated. There is a youth who says that "he served the devil just as well as he could wish till last week." There is another who urged the overseer to have the engine stopped to hear how he could blaspheme the name of Jesus. Why are these two taken while many of their exemplary, moral fellow-workmen are left? Why has the Spirit entered into this house and passed over that? Why is that athletic man, sneering at the whole affair as fanaticism, *compelled* to go down on his knees to plead for mercy, and his amiable, delicate neighbour not moved or refreshed in the least, though saying that he is "wishing for it?" How is it that that man, on his way home from market, at one time *constrained* to pray, at another resisting the impulse with the violence of an unsubdued, blaspheming bacchanalian, is so yielding to the Spirit when he awakes next morning?'—*History of the Revival in Ballymena*, pp. 28, 29.

We believe that this is a fair specimen of Revival teaching; and few individuals have more impressed their own characteristics upon the movement than Mr. Moore. We must demur to the statement that this is 'true doctrine.' It holds in solution the elements of some of the most enormous heresies that have ever blighted Christianity; and in the last analysis involves Manicheism, Fatalism, Pantheism. We have here a theology and an anthropology;—a theology which teaches that the all-Holy Spirit, the Holy Ghost, the Comforter, who is promised to them that ask Him of the Father, capriciously passes over those who solicit His presence, and selects the impure soul for His habitation; that the way to know of the doctrine whether it be of God is *not* to do His will; that the sole mode of His communication is by convulsive bodily agitation;—an anthropology which makes the human will as passive as a stick or

¹ Surely the physical seizures are a very strong presumption of the *novelty* of the doctrine. The preaching of St. Paul, or of St. Augustine, did not produce these manifestations; *therefore*, it was different from Ulster preaching.

stone, necessarily determined *ab extra*, and consequently, by logical sequence, darkens the moral character of God and evacuates the responsibility of man. But, passing over this, the test of *true doctrine* cannot well be applied. The argument for Papal infallibility, founded upon the Pope's having never been involved in heresy, has always seemed to us to move in a circle. At most it can but prove that the Popes have taught *consistently*, not that they have taught *truly*, because they themselves are the sole judges of truth. It amounts to this:—'We have taught the truth, *because* we have consistently taught what we assert to be true.' So with Revival doctrine. Our Dissenting friends tell us that it is true, because it squares with that which they have always asserted to be true.

As to the *social* results, we are told a good deal of 'the Pentecostal unity of all Evangelical denominations.' This amounts, we suspect, to a temporary association with those who will act with the revivalists, and a deep, dark, and unrelenting hostility against those who will not. As for the clergymen of the Church, who, under more sober and sagacious guidance than that of the Bishop of Down, have quietly held their own way, 'blind guide,' and 'phylacteried ecclesiasticism,' have been about the kindest words applied to them. Presbyterian and Methodist, Socinian and Calvinist, have floated together for a time, like oil and vinegar, in the same vessel. How far the acid Puritanical and unctuous Wesleyan element will ever blend and coalesce, time will prove. The mixture is already fermenting. Several months ago, Mr. Moore was hitting hard at 'the anxious seat,' and 'a specimen of ignorance, cruelty, and blasphemy in a certain chapel,' evidently, from the context, Baptist or Methodist. Indeed, the Baptists and Plymouth Brethren are 'tabooed' by the ruling denominations—why, we cannot conceive, upon their own principles.

It is but right to observe, that we have certainly remarked a considerable improvement of tone among the Protestant population, in reference to their Roman Catholic neighbours. Personal prejudice appears to have been softened, and the last anniversary of the 12th of July passed off with unusual quietness.

Any advantages, however, which may be considered to have accrued, must be admitted to be liable to heavy deductions.

The returns of lunacy will soon tell their own tale. Let us be understood in the conclusions which we would draw from these. If it should appear that the sum-total of madness is *not* increased, but that the item of religious madness is swelled very largely, we should not consider that such a fact told against revivalism (except so far as theomania, or religious melancholy, might be worse forms of insanity than others), because we

know the tendency of madness to mould itself according to dominant social ideas. But if, as we think certain, the sum-total of madness in the province of Ulster should turn out to be largely increased, the fact will of course tell very strongly against revivalism, in the estimation of those who believe man's moral and spiritual nature to be the handiwork of the Author of revelation, and who think it *à priori* most improbable that He should by his direct agency snap the golden strings of the grandest instrument which even His hand has made. Archdeacon Stopford writes—'Among the fruits of hysteria, I must notice the insanity which it has already produced. In a very brief space of time, and in a very limited circle of enquiry, I saw or heard of more than twenty cases, some of a shocking character.' Mr. M'Ilwaine, writing in January, 1860, observes, 'Insanity, generally in one of its worst forms, *theomania*, and not unfrequently in others, perhaps equally to be dreaded, such as *acute mania*, has been developed to a fearful extent. Speaking guardedly, I may assert that, from unquestionable sources, I have come to the knowledge of at least *fifty* such cases within the last six months in this immediate neighbourhood.' In three of our asylums, not to mention the numerous cases which could not and cannot be admitted, owing to the overcrowded condition of the asylums, no fewer than thirty-three patients (five male, and twenty-eight female) have been received during the space of time above mentioned, whose derangement is clearly referable to this cause.' We can add to this statement that we have ascertained that sixteen patients have been received into the Onagh, and about twenty into the Derry Asylum, whose derangement can be traced to revivalism. We are acquainted with lamentable instances ourselves, where cerebral exaltation, stimulated by the effort of addressing a group of people or praying publicly, has resulted in madness. Frequently, boys of gentle, timid character and slow natural parts have astounded meetings by a flow of impassioned utterance, and then become raving lunatics. Henry More has illustrated this phenomenon by an analogy of exquisite beauty:—'Enthusiasts have spoken very *raisedly* and *divinely*, which most certainly has happened to sundry persons a little before they have grown stark mad. This unquiet and tumultuous spirit of melancholy, shaking their whole bodily frame, is like an earthquake to one in a dungeon, which for a small moment makes the very walls gape and cleave, and so lets in light for a while at those chinks; but all closes up again suddenly, and the prisoner is confined to his wonted darkness. This therefore was a change in nature, not a

¹ *Enthusiasmus Triumphatus*, p. 40.

‘gracious visit of the Spirit of God.’ One sweet and gentle boy we heard of, belonging to rather a better class, who was ‘affected’ at a prayer-meeting. He was urged to pray, and did so with strange pathos and unction. His parents took him to one or two more meetings, where he prayed publicly. Alas! the excitement worked like fire in his brain, and in a few hours after his last address he was dead. Such are the punishments which the God of nature imposes upon an insane violation of the laws of reason, Scripture, and His Church! The genuine revivalist rather glories in these ‘mysterious cases.’ Mr. Moore writes coolly and with some complacency:—

‘The minds of some three poor creatures have given way. The first of these is now quite well, and spiritually happy. The second is in the asylum, slowly improving. *The third died.* I visited the second of these cases, and amid all her frenzy and wild, maniac wanderings at intervals, she held firm by Christ. Some one said to her that I had come to see her; she wildly, *yet perhaps wisely*, replied, “Mr. Moore! I don’t want him; let him go to them that sent for him. He can do me no good. Jesus Christ alone can hold me.”’

We leave this without comment.

The flood of what we cannot help calling *blasphemy*, which has been let loose over the country, should not be forgotten. Is it nothing for women to stand up (we have heard it), and to exclaim to a heated crowd, ‘Thus saith the Lord;’ when He hath not sent them?—Nothing for young women of coarse and irreverent temperament to describe personal interviews with Him at whose name every knee should bow, in language so erotic, that our ears yet tingle at the recollection?—Nothing for multitudes to follow men who preached with ‘blue hands;’ females who by help of a blue bag traced sacred names upon their persons; boys who professed to ‘blow the Holy Spirit into any one with three breaths of their mouth?’ It seems to us that humiliation and prayer would be a more fitting attitude for ‘the religious public,’ than an insane self-glorification.

Much more might be mentioned. The religious shamelessness which blurted out before the world emotions which, if real, should have been kept for God alone—if simulated, were monstrous blasphemies; the unreality which grasped Bibles that were little read, and shouted out in streets and gatherings the devotions that in private were little used; the childish instability that sent the people in shoals after canting and unholy knaves; the intense pride that veiled itself under the garb of an unbounded humility; the hatred and all uncharitableness roared out, under the pretence of prayer, to the awful Father of Spirits—all these were prodigiously stimulated by the Ulster Revival;

and he who denies their existence in a very large measure, is either ignorant of the facts, or wilfully conceals what he knows.

III. It still remains for us to consider the bearings of all these facts upon the position of the Church in England. How should a minister of that Church act in relation to attempts 'to get up a Revival' in England? How should he comport himself if a similar movement were to sweep round our cities and parishes? We should be utterly averse from any attempt to swell such an excitement, even in our own direction. Religious fanaticism is an edged tool, pretty sure to cut the fingers of those who play with it. In a parish already decently worked, and with *several services* besides the Sunday routine, we should be slow in introducing anything extra. We should not advise controversial sermons, strongly against revivalism, but sensible discourses, with premises which the people will be able to apply for themselves. It will also be the pastor's interest, as it is his bounden duty, to show his flock that trust in Christ, love of His great love, prayer for the Holy Spirit's influences, are recognised and expected by the Church, not less, but rather more, than by any separatists whatever; that communion with our Blessed Lord is to be specially found in the Holy Eucharist; that it is not at all real earnestness which we condemn, but rather that which in the end might lessen it. A simple strain of *extempore* address will be best adapted to such a season. Parochial visitings should be constant. Details about revivalism may be then safe and useful, and a calm, sensible public opinion will gradually be formed. All 'stricken' persons should be carefully visited, and their fears and anxieties tenderly dealt with.

It is, of course, highly improbable that most readers of these pages will ever dream of joining an undisciplined crew of miscellaneous sectarians, under the notion that exceptional circumstances exonerate them from the fulfilment of their ordination vow as priests of the English Church. Yet from ground which, one would hope, must be common to all ministers of the Church, we venture to state several reasons which seem to prove that to persons in the position of English clergymen, it is *safest* to abstain from all active part in getting up a Revival.

In the first place, then, English clergymen may have read Prime's 'Power of Prayer,' or Arthur's 'Tongue of Fire,' or a pocketful of Massies, Moores, and Baillies; but after all they simply *know* nothing about it. They imagine that they can head, guide, steer, such a movement. But they do not know the frightful disadvantage at which educated men and gentlemen are placed in such circumstances.

Let them recollect, further (as Mr. Oulton has powerfully

put it), that they are doing something much more than merely trying an experiment. That experiment will be renewed again and again. They are entailing a *new* agency on the Church.¹ They are acting for generations yet unborn. Most of us have read the story of the wild New England Revivals, and the rough but vigorous sketches of the consequences of Whitfield's preaching, in the documents given by the Bishop of Oxford in his *History of the American Church*. The sects never allowed these hints to drop. No year since 1795 has been without a Revival, more or less extensive.

Still further, we think, that revivalism is much more likely to do harm in England than in Ireland. Infidelity is unknown in Ireland. The people are not so numerous as to be beyond the reach of religious teachers. Very gross religious ignorance is uncommon. Hence there is a great protection, not against Christian fanaticism, but against fanaticism cunningly moulded into antichristian shapes. Portentous sects would, in England, spring up from such a seething mass as Belfast contained last June.

We think it right also that it should be well weighed, whether, granting that revivalism is much more Divine than we think, it is *meant* for us, and not for others. It may be the Providential work of the sects around us to produce such an agitation; it may be equally our Providential work to mind our own business. Revivalism is not in our way, it is in their way.

It is our earnest wish that history should be interrogated upon parallel movements. She has many facts, and important principles may be drawn from them. In the bosom of the French Church, in the last century, Jansenism arose. It was illustrated by the genius and piety of Port Royal. The pensive sublimity, the austere holiness, the lofty powers of Pascal—with a mind which had something of Newton, of Butler, and of Leighton in its marvellous temperament—alone cover Jansenism with glory. Jansenism expresses the protest of some of the holiest children of the Roman Church against the wordliness which was making her atmosphere unwholesome, and against the ever-developing technical system, which was chaining the aspirations of many souls after the free grace of God. Few members of our church will deny that Jansenism was, on the whole, the cause of God. How many Jansenists are there now?

¹ Two prize essays on revivals have lately been offered, of which a dignity of the Church, a Wesleyan, an Independent, a Free Church and a Baptist minister, are the adjudicators. Among the topics to be handled, according to the conditions proposed, are, 'counsels for the *guidance of needful agencies*,' i.e. it is blasphemy to deny that the Holy Spirit supersedes all human instruments, and works directly from heaven, in Revivals. At the same time, it is necessary to construct machinery to produce the influence and to direct it afterwards!

What was the cause of its decadence? Translated into more modern and Protestant language, it was a Revival. The *convulsionnaire* phenomena were more amazing than those of the Ulster revivalists. In the precincts of Saint-Médard careless men of the world were 'prostrated,' sinners 'convicted,' peace found, hearts converted. Read the narrative of M. de Montgeron, and, *mutatis mutandis*, you seem to read Dr. Massie. Gentlemen and ladies (this, indeed, is a distinction—no such, we believe, were prostrated in Ulster), servants and shopkeepers, priests and nuns, were seized with physical manifestations of the most marvellous nature. Theomania and hysteria, complicated with demonopathy, nymphomania, and ecstasy, attained to their wildest development in the widow Thevenet and others. The *secours* and *estrapades*, the crucifixions and burning of the robes round women, complete the lists of extravagances. It was not until 1766 that the convulsions ceased. 'I cannot,' says Montègre, 'speak of the *convulsionnaires* who barked, who 'mewed, who prophesied, who said mass, for we find all sorts; 'and what is most strange is, that so many follies only confirmed 'their partizans in the opinion of the divinity of such a work.'¹ But physiology, even then, was mapping out and assigning each of these supposed tokens of superhuman favour to its specific district of nervous or cerebral disease. Ridicule succeeded to awe, and Jansenism never recovered the contempt into which it was thrown by a Revival movement which at one time seemed almost to have subdued luxurious and profligate Paris. Another illustration occurs. We have before alluded to the prophets of the Cévennes. The virtues of these simple people, and the atrocious cruelties exercised upon them by the French officers of Louis XIV. and the horrid Abbé du Chayla, have invested them with the deepest interest. Foreign Protestantism has had no martyrs so romantic. But their Revival, with its singular developments, if it has directed attention to their story, has also connected their name with degrading associations. French Roman Catholic writers set them down as *énergumènes*. Physiologists and psychologists discuss their mental and bodily system. Those who look upon them with most reverence are puzzled by the fact that their miracles crumble away at a touch, and that their prophesies turned out ludicrously false. The London of 1702 received the physical affections of these persecuted people, some of whom escaped to England, with shouts of derision, and the movement, which seems so holy in Brousson, and so graceful

¹ Dictionnaire des Sciences Médicales, Art. Convulsionnaires. In an article on the physical concomitants of Revivals, reprinted from the *Princeton Review*, will be found ample evidence to the existence of precisely similar effects in Kentucky and elsewhere.

in Cavalier, finally transmigrates into the despicable fanaticism of the Shakers. But we have parallels of more modern date, and of habits nearer to our own. We pass by the West Indian negroes, who are favoured with more frequent Revivals than any other population, and we turn to America. We have most important evidence in Dr. Sprague's Lectures on Revivals of Religion, which were republished in this country, with an introductory essay by the late Mr. John Angell James. Dr. Sprague states that America had never been without Revivals since 1795. He writes with an honest conviction, indeed, of their divinity—with glowing expectations of their future—but with large experience of their evils, and a manful resolution to speak the whole truth, which has been sadly wanting in 1859. Now upon turning to Dr. Sprague's eighth lecture, on evils to be avoided in connexion with Revivals—a lecture, be it observed, founded upon the personal knowledge of some thirty or forty—there is enough to stagger the most sanguine. The evils are ranged under no less than *nine* heads. These are most significant, and each seems written for this day. Here they are:—Cherishing of false hopes, a spirit of self-confidence, a spirit of censoriousness, inconstancy in religion, ostentation, undervaluing Divine institutions and Divine truth, lessening the influence and impairing the dignity of the ministerial office, setting up false standards of Christian character, and corrupting the purity of the Church. This, surely, is enough to make one pause, and ask whether movements, of which a partial, but not dishonest chronicler is obliged to make such a confession, are so desirable as some would tell us. But other American works on Revivals bring out other features into relief. Mr. Stowe, in a volume of 'Thoughts,' represents multitudes as plunged in reckless sin, or waiting in dead stupidity like logs by the side of a river, in expectation of a Revival freshet to float them away to the other shore. Another work, by Dr. Spring, among the causes of the inefficiency of Revivals reckons the unbelief of ministers. It is a graphic picture of moral degradation. All Evangelical ministers, he says, are forced to join in these tumults, or their people would desert them; but a very large portion of these teachers utterly disbelieve in the Divine original of these agitations, which they attribute to human excitement or even to diabolical malignity. It is difficult quite to understand what even so logical a writer as Jonathan Edwards makes of the whole thing. The town which, with one breath, he tells us is converted, seems to be again unconverted forthwith, by a visit from His Excellency the Governor, by the Springfield controversy, and even by so innocent a work as building a meeting-house. Mr. Alexander Knox, who was intimately acquainted with Edwards' writings, speaks thus of

him:—‘He had witnessed great religious emotion, both in his own congregation and in other parts of New England. He saw much to be jealous of, even at the time; and published two successive tracts, both to plead for what he thought genuine, and to correct what he deemed erroneous. But in a few years, though much of the good fruit seemed to remain, so great a part was blighted, that he thought it expedient to enter more deeply into the subject. And hence proceeded his book on the Affections.’¹ But the Appendix to Dr. Sprague’s volume contains twenty letters from various ministers, who had large experience in Revivals, from which we make no apology for extracting some passages.

‘A Revival, or religious excitement, may exist, and be very powerful, and affect many minds, when the producing cause is not the Spirit of God, and when the truth of God is not the means of the awakening. This we must believe, unless we adopt the opinion that the Holy Spirit accompanies error by his operations as well as truth, which would be blasphemous. Religious excitements have been common among Pagans, Mahomedans, heretics, and Papists. And, in our own time, there have been great religious excitements among those who reject the fundamental doctrines of the Gospel, as, for example, among the *Chrystians*, who are Unitarians, and the New Lights, or schismatics of the west, and the Campbellites, who deny the proper divinity of our Lord, and the scriptural doctrine of the Atonement. The whole religion of the Shakers, also, consists in religious excitement.

‘As genuine Revivals are favourable to truth and orthodoxy, so spurious excitements furnish one of the most effectual vehicles for error and heresy. The Church is not always benefited by what are termed Revivals, but sometimes the effects of such commotions are followed by a desolation which resembles the track of a tornado. I have never seen so great insensibility in any people as in those who had been the subjects of violent religious excitement, and I have never seen any sinners so bold and reckless in their impiety as those who had once been loud professors, and foremost in the time of Revival. If I had time, I might illustrate this remark, by a reference to the great Revival of the West, which commenced about the close of the year 1800, in the south part of Kentucky, and by which the Presbyterian Church in that region was for so many years broken, distracted, and prostrated; but I forbear. The premature and injudicious publication of Revivals is now a great evil. There is in these accounts often a *cant* which greatly disgusts sensible men, and there is an exaggeration which confounds those who know the facts, and it cannot but injure the people concerning whom the narrative treats.’²—*Extract from a Letter of the Rev. A. Alexander, D.D.*

‘A tendency to spiritual pride needs frequently to be corrected. Young converts are often put forward too rapidly, and induced to address congregations. These exhortations are sometimes attended with good effects, and are, by the injudicious, applauded. Hence they are prone to vanity, self-exaltation, and censoriousness. The same effect is produced on Christians who are trusting to the means of grace, instead of to the Spirit of God.’—*Extract from a Letter of the Rev. F. Wayland, D.D.*

¹ Remains of A. Knox, vol. iv. p. 515.

² We recommend this passage to the writers and circulators of Revival tracts.

“If we look back,” says the eminently wise and experienced President Edwards, “if we look back into the history of the Church of God in past ages, we may observe that it has been a common device of the devil to upset a Revival of religion; when he finds he can keep men quiet and secure no longer, then to drive them into excesses and extravagances. He holds them back as long as he can, but when he can do it no longer, then he will push them on, and, if possible, run them upon their heads. And it has been by this means, chiefly, that he has been successful, in many instances, to overthrow most hopeful and promising beginnings. Yea, the principal means by which the devil was successful, by degrees, to upset that grand religious Revival of the world that was in the primitive ages of Christianity, and, in a manner, to overthrow the Christian Church through the earth, and to make way for and bring on the grand antichristian apostasy—that masterpiece of all the devil’s works—was, to improve the indiscreet zeal of Christians, to drive them into those three extremes of *enthusiasm, superstition, and severity towards opposers*, which should be enough for an everlasting warning to the Christian Church. And though the devil will do his utmost to stir up the open enemies of religion, yet he knows what is for his interest so well, that, in a time of Revival of religion, his main strength shall be tried with the friends of it, and he will chiefly exert himself in his attempts upon them to mislead them. One truly zealous person, in the time of such an event, that seems to have a great hand in the affair, and draws the eyes of many upon him, may do more (through Satan’s being too subtle for him) to hinder the work, than a hundred great, strong, and open opposers.” “Yet here, again, some of the managers in this heart-elevating scene left upon it the print of their fingers, and thus created unsightly spots in a blaze of glory. He who will take the trouble to consult the fourth part of the venerable Edwards’ treatise on that Revival, as well as some other contemporaneous publications, will find evidence of this fact, as painful as it is unquestionable. He will find that, amidst the most gratifying evidence that good seeds and good fruit predominated, the enemy was permitted to sow tares, which sprang up with the wheat, and, in some cases, almost choked it. The disorders of *lay preaching* well nigh brought the ministry, in some places, into contempt. The outcries, the praying and exhorting by *females* in public, grieved the hearts of judicious Christians. The language of *harsh censure*, and of uncharitable *denunciation* as ‘unconverted persons,’ as ‘blind leaders of the blind,’ as ‘devout leaders to hell,’ was directed towards some of the best ministers of Christ in the community, because they disapproved of these irregularities. Public *confessions* of secret sins were warmly urged and actually made, and crimes altogether unsuspected brought to light, to the disgrace of Christian character and the destruction of domestic peace. Thus scenes which were, no doubt, intended to make a deep and salutary moral impression, were made the subject of unhallowed speculation and the themes of a thousand tongues. All these things were urged with the confidence of oracular wisdom, and whoever ventured to lisp anything like doubt or opposition, was publicly stigmatised as an enemy to Revivals, and an opposer of vital piety.” “It is true Mr. Davenport, in 1744, became sensible of his folly and sin, and published an humble confession and recantation, in which he acknowledged that he had been actuated by a wrong spirit, lamented many parts of his conduct, and was, in some measure, restored to the fellowship of his injured brethren. But to repair the mischief that he had done was beyond his power. The friends of Zion had been clad in mourning, her enemies had triumphed, truth lay bleeding in the streets. Congregations had been torn in pieces and scattered; new societies had been established on fanatical principles, and could not be reclaimed. Immortal souls had been

disgusted with what claimed to be religion, driven from the house of God, and, probably, lost for ever. The enemies of real Revivals of religion, who were many and powerful, had probably become hardened in their hostility, and many personal and ecclesiastical desolations had been produced, over which their author might weep, but which he could not remedy."

"This excitement began in Logan, in Kentucky, but soon spread over the neighbouring states. There were, during the summers of 1800, 1801, and 1802, *large camp meetings* held, and a number of days and nights spent in unceasing religious devotions. In these meetings hundreds, and sometimes thousands of people, might have been seen at the same time, engaged in singing and prayer, in exhortation and preaching, in leaping, shouting, disputing and conversing, with a confusion scarcely describable. A love of excitement and agitation seemed to take possession of the people. A number of hot-headed young men, intoxicated with the prevailing element, though entirely destitute of any suitable education, assumed the office of public instructors. These were soon afterwards licensed to preach; a majority of the Presbytery hoping that, though not regularly qualified, they might be useful. When once this door was opened, it was found difficult to close it. Candidates were freely licensed and ordained, who declined adopting the confession of faith of the Presbyterian Church in the usual form. They were received on their declaration that they adopted that confession 'only so far as they considered it as agreeing with the word of God.' The consequence was, that Arminians and Pelagians actually entered the Presbyterian Church."—*From a Letter by the Rev. A. Hyde.*

"You are aware of the result of this great religious excitement. There were many, doubtless, who became truly pious; but Cumberland Presbyterianism, Shakerism, Socinianism, and Deism, reaped a large part of the harvest that grew up from the seed sown by the Revival men at that time. It was followed by an open avowal and general prevalence of infidel principles, beyond anything that had previously appeared."—*Letter of the Rev. A. Green.*

There is one apology for revivalism which we have heard advanced by a subtle thinker, and which it may be well to notice, though we shall, probably, impair its force by our mode of expression. This Irish agitation, it was urged, is, indeed, strictly speaking, based upon a delusion—that of direct Divine action upon the minds of those who are thus agitated. But the delusion is of such a nature as to have a tendency to produce effects analogous to those which would be produced by the reality. Nor is there the danger which is found to accompany pious frauds in the Roman Church, where many are religiously impressed, and many, perhaps, tempted to infidelity. For the delusion in one case is in the sphere of facts, and may be discovered; in the other case, it is in the sphere of thought, where it almost defies detection. We cannot think that this reasoning is sound. To admit it would be to exalt fanaticism to faith—to confess that the effects of human fancy are identical with those of Divine grace. Nor do we conceive that ordinary minds are incapable of such an analysis as will suggest to them that they have been under a delusion. It is a fact, at least, that very

many of the 'convicts' or 'converts' of last summer and autumn are now confessing openly that their 'striking' was altogether owing to nervous causes. We are afraid that the discovery will not tend to their good, and we should never attempt to force it upon any one.¹

But to return to the inference suggested by the history of past Revivals. America has been favoured with them for the last sixty-five years without intermission. If we are to believe Dr. Prime and the author of the Revival tract which appears as an article in the last number of the *Quarterly Review*, New York, but two years ago, was changed into a department of the heavenly city, and five hundred thousand souls added to the Church in the Union. Yet it is too painfully evident that the words of Him who 'knew all men' and 'knew what is in man,' remain unrepealed: 'immediately it sprang up, *because it had no depth of earth.*' The Revival organs lament that the very winter after the great Revival was the most frivolous and dissipated which even New York ever knew; that the famous Fulton Street prayer-meeting had collapsed into something much smaller than the attendance upon daily service in one of our own churches, small though that, too generally, is; that lassitude and coldness had succeeded to the fiery excitement. Undeniable statistics prove that wickedness of every kind rolled on in the same dark, feculent stream, with rather an access of filth from its multitudinous sewers. Need we point to the state of the slave question; to the utter degradation of public opinion, manifested in the Sickles tragedy; to the language used in the senate with applause; to the murderous duels which almost every newspaper records? We may be told that religion has no right to be submitted to such a test; that her action is not upon masses of men, but upon individual souls; that she is a flower which grows comparatively unseen, beautiful to God and to herself. This we think most true; but then it is an abnegation of the very essence of revivalism. Revivalism asserts the temporary repeal of the law enunciated by our Blessed Lord, 'Narrow is the way, and few there be that find it.' It asserts

¹ It appears to us that a certain kind of religious teaching is coming in, which is likely to do injury, in the long run, to the national character. The theory of habit, taught by Butler and Aristotle, is sneered at by our new philosophy as crude and coarse, by our new theology as unspiritual. Professor Jowett asserts that Butler's rule—that 'as the passive impression weakens, the active habit strengthens'—is 'founded on a narrow and partial contemplation of human nature,' and forgets that 'whatever moralists may say, man knows himself to be a spiritual being. The wind bloweth where it list.' But Bishop Butler leaves a margin for what are called sudden conversions: 'Nor do we know how far it is possible that effects should be wrought in us, at once, equivalent to habit; the thing insisted upon is, not what may be possible, but what is, in fact, the appointment of nature.' Compare Isaac Barrow, 'Habitus Humani.' 'Non de habitibus infusus sed acquisitis questionem instituo.'

the localization of spiritual influences in favoured spots, and the immediate conversion of masses of man. When it is overwhelmed by an array of countervailing facts, it cannot recede from its position and say, 'After all, these movements only convert a few!' without giving up everything for which it contended. Revivalism, in truth, is *individualism* in its fullest expansion. It is *monster-meetingism* puritanized. It is religion made republican and American. We remember to have seen this assertion made in an able American work upon Revivals. Europe, according to the author's argument, is growing tired of monarchy and aristocracy in every shape. She will soon be moulded into the form of a *congeries* of great republics. But revivalism is essentially republican, and implies republican institutions. Republican Europe will have a republican religion; and behold the millennium!

With these views of revivalism, and with the fact of a pure branch of Christ's Church set up among us by God's great mercy to this land and people, we almost doubt whether the union of members (much more ministers) of that Church, with sectarians of every name, to pray for a special outpouring of the Holy Spirit, be not real faithlessness. The prize-essay project, mentioned in a former note, invites a discussion of 'the *means* 'to be employed in order to an *immediate extension* of Christ's 'kingdom.' The characteristic of true faith is, that he 'who possesses it, shall not make haste.' The limitation of our faculties represents to us many objects as good, which a more enlarged view of things would clearly show us to be evil. Here there is a temptation to impatience with the evolution of God's counsels. True faith, we humbly think, would never presume to speak of '*means* for an *immediate extension* of God's kingdom.' She knows too well the vastness of God's infinite plan, and the imbecility of her own speculations. She does not insist upon 'an *immediate extension* of God's kingdom,' for she remembers who said, 'It is not for you to know the times or the seasons.' She works her appointed work, not because she expects instantaneous success, but because 'her work is with the 'Lord, and her judgment with her God.' Ever enduring, as 'seeing Him who is invisible,' and expecting the coming of her Lord, while, on the one hand, she dare not assign that coming to a season, even a few years distant, lest she should seem to assert that He is not to be expected in the interval; on the other hand she would not 'bate a jot of heart or hope,' if she knew that that glorious coming were separated from her by millenniums. 'At the end it shall speak, and not lie; though it tarry, wait for it.' Here, then, quite apart from any special 'Church views,' seems to us to be a strong objection against the prayer-meetings now so largely advertised. If prayer be

offered for ends which our own wilfulness dictates, the answer may be, 'They have chosen their own ways, I also will choose their delusions.' The history of modern fanaticism presents one striking example. About the year 1828, Mr. J. H. Stewart, minister of Percy Chapel, published a pamphlet, in which he called upon 'all Christians to unite in earnest prayer for a general and immediate outpouring of the Holy Spirit.' Three large editions of this pamphlet were soon exhausted. The Tract Society abridged it for general circulation. Mr. Stewart travelled over England to establish great prayer-meetings, and was most successful. The *Morning Watch*, Edward Irving's organ, puts this dilemma to the Evangelical world. 'Either your prayers were *not* answered; or, if answered, show the reply in any other department than the gifts of Mr. Irving's Church.'¹ There is another solution. What if the principle of such prayers implied a blindness to the truth that the great Pentecostal stream never ceases to flow for those who have eyes to see it; an unthankfulness to Him who in his Church is evermore 'pouring forth of His Spirit upon all flesh?' What, if to tell Him in prayer that the stream of His grace was frozen at the fountain; that His word was ineffectual, and His Sacrament light bread, were displeasing in His sight? What if a morbid and feverish prayer received for answer a morbid and feverish delusion?

The physical concomitants of the Ulster Revival have necessarily occupied a considerable portion of our space. No agitation of the kind will ever make way in England without these. We implore all decent Christian men to pause before they lend themselves to the diffusion of such spasmodic affections. While the revivalist is counting off his slain, while he prides himself upon the strong men 'dropping as if shot,' and the women 'yelling,' the psychologist and physiologist are there, and with a pencil which in its own department is unerring—for true science is the expression of a law of God—are writing him down dupe or knave. The infidel stands sneering by. 'This,' yells the revivalist, 'is Pentecost over again. This is the secret of the conversion of S. Paul. Here you have the vision of S. John.'² 'Be it so,' answers the unbeliever; 'I accept your premises, and the world shall know my conclusion.'³ We

¹ The *Morning Watch*. History of the Present Manifestations of Spiritual Gifts. Vol. iv. pp. 469—474.

² 'In some cases quite as glorious as that enjoyed by the apostle John. A smile of celestial loveliness plays over the countenance, though perhaps naturally plain,' &c.—*History of the Revival*. By the Rev. Samuel J. Moore, p. 12.

³ When writing the above sentences, we had not seen the article upon Christian Revivals in the last *Westminster Review*, of which they contain a summary by anticipation.

will only add to this, that medical science is at present largely occupied with the bearings of religious emotion upon men's bodily constitution. It is curious and instructive to observe, how completely its conclusions fit into the system of the Church, as it exists in our land. If there be any axioms of practical theology received by English Churchmen generally, they are such as these—that much religious profession or talk is, as a general rule, not to be encouraged; that the pulpit, valuable and precious as it is, is not the central sun of the system; that *duty* is a better test than feeling; that emotions are only valuable so far as they lead to deeper practical love to God and man. Compare this with the language of an eminent physician in the *Journal of Mental Science*.—

'We ask the people of this country to stand up and resist this profanation of all the sacredness of nature and revelation, carried on under the specious name of religious Revival. The proper means of prevention we proceed to notice. *Avoid talking Religion.* Avoid all kinds of religious excitement. Popular preachers, as a general rule, *are* popular, because of the undue, that is morbid, development of some feature of character... It behoves all educated adult persons to place before the Clergy the serious evils which arise from giving an undue importance to oral excitement (we do not call it "teaching") from the pulpit and platform. Preaching is a monstrous evil when used for the purpose of producing hysteria, or any kind of excito-motory disturbance. It behoves all parents and guardians to discourage in the young an intensifying and emotional religion, by finding a fitting outlet for inward emotions in the active practical duties of life.'

May we not see in all this a fresh instance of the Divine *tact* (so to speak) which has moulded the public worship of the Church? The rigid rule of adhesion to the apostolic ministry, the simple but beautiful ritual, the prescribed Liturgy, are defences drawn by Divine tenderness round our feeble humanity. Granting (what, however, we deny) that a prescribed ritual was wanting in the most primitive years of the Christian Church, Revivals, we think, make it manifest that extemporaneous prayer is literally *unsafe*, without direct interference of the Spirit.

Surely, too, all that is real in a religious Revival may be had, free from extravagance and pollution, in the system of our Church. We have there a machinery of heavenly institution, whose working capabilities are something more than an experiment. Let any Clergyman read that most solemn letter, prefixed by Bishop Wilson to his *Parochialia*, and rise up from his knees to put it in practice among his people in the Church's annual Lenten Revival. When our brethren have tried the means provided to their hands and impressed upon them by oaths which they have voluntarily taken, then, but not before, shall we consider them guiltless in joining the motley crew of sectaries,

who wish to introduce an Americanized religion through the ruined battlements of the Church of England. If the Irish Revival be, in all probability, a human agitation, intensified by natural laws of imitation and sympathy; if its so-called miraculous phases be among the most lamentable imbecilities of fanaticism which the world has perhaps ever witnessed; if the undeniable good which it has wrought be rather in individual instances which have subsequently fallen into judicious hands; if all honest advocates of Revivals are obliged to confess that, so far as experience reaches, they are contaminated by formidable evils; if those lands in which revivalism is an established form, a stereotyped agency, are rather a warning than an example to sober Christians—we entreat our brethren to be watchful and steadfast. We venture to turn, with respectful earnestness, to those of our Evangelical Clergy who will listen to our voice. The strongest warnings from Ireland come from those whom they will not disown. The movement, which began with Port Royal and the Provincials, ended in the hysterical follies of Saint-Médard. Is the movement—dear to them, and scarcely less dear to us—which commenced with the robust sense of Simeon and Cecil, and kindled the seraphic holiness of Henry Martyn, to explode in an epileptic parody of the blessed mystery of Pentecost?

Yet, perhaps, these feverish agitations may be shadows of a great reality. Perhaps, as the shapes of evil stand out in more gigantic relief against the sunset-sky of the evening of the world, the powers of the Church may be quickened into a grander development to cope with those awful adversaries. We speak guardedly; for any arguments drawn from the prophecy of Joel, and from 'the last days' mentioned in it, seem to us more than precarious, as applied to the close of this dispensation; while our Lord's comparison of the state of the world at His coming, to that which existed in the days of Noe and of Lot, and the immediately-succeeding parable of the importunate widow,¹ might lead us to expect that even then good and evil—the Church and the world—will be pretty much in their present relative positions. But if such a deep and genuine Revival is ever to gladden the heart of the Bride, it will not be won by blowing trumpets, and praying in the streets; by parading monster-meetings in the *Times*; by blazoning forth silly exaggerations in extravagant pamphlets. Not thus came the Great Teacher in the beauty of his Divine quietness. Thrice only in his most blessed ministry did He, 'whose voice

¹ S. Luke xvii. 26—30; xviii. 1—8.

was not to be heard in the streets,' *cry* with impassioned vehemence.¹ At last came the Cross and Passion. His Church has His example to follow, as she may have His cup to drain. Let the world have its noisy Revivals. Let the cry of hysteria be chronicled. The world 'cannot receive' the Blessed Spirit, 'because it *seeth* Him not.' But the faithful children of the Church recognize 'His goings in the sanctuary.' The fir, the olive, and the lily, are types of their growth under the silent droppings of sacramental dew. From the foot of the altar and the cross, they go forth to the lanes of great cities, to penitentiaries, to hospitals, to death-beds, to school-rooms; or, if their duties lie at home, to 'the common round, the daily walk.' *Their* deeds may be unchronicled, or meet with contempt and unpopularity. So much the greater their reward.

Meanwhile, when they are told of new modes of Christ's coming, of 'Pentecosts' in New York, Belfast, or London, they turn to the Book, and read:—

'If any man shall say unto you, lo, here is Christ, or there; believe it not.

'For there shall rise false Christs, and false prophets, and shall show great signs and wonders.

'Behold, I have told you before. Wherefore if they shall say unto you, Behold, he is in the desert; go not forth: behold, he is in the secret chambers; believe it not.

'For as the lightning cometh out of the east, and shineth even unto the west, so shall also the coming of the Son of Man be.'

¹ S. John vii. 28, 37; xii. 44.

ART. VI.—1. *Ueber die Ueberreste der Altbabylonischen Literatur in Arabischen Uebersetzungen* von D. CHWOLSON. S. Petersburg. 1859.

2. *On the Remains of Old Babylonian Literature in Arabic Translations.* By D. CHWOLSON. S. Petersburg. 1859.

THE learned and distinguished writer of this extraordinary treatise gives in it an account of a series of documents which, if genuine, cast a most unexpected light upon the darkest period of early history. The vast interval between the building of the tower of Babel and the appearance of Babylon, at the dawn of secular history as the capital of the most powerful empire of antiquity, has hitherto baffled the researches of antiquarians. From ancient sources we learn little which accounts for the undoubted influence of that city upon the religious and social development of the heathen world; nor have the monumental inscriptions deciphered by MM. Grotefend, Lassen, Oppert, or Rawlinson, supplied us with a clue to the mysteries buried beneath the ruins of Babylon. Now, however, we are told by a man of incontestable reputation, that in the very midst of that interval, before the accession of the dynasties known to us from Scriptural or from classical records, there existed a literature of which no inconsiderable remains are for the first time presented to European readers. The documents before us represent the writers as living at a time when Babylon was the centre of ancient civilization, when the fine arts were cultivated with success, when science, based upon accurate observation, proceeding on rational principles, and directed to the most practical objects, had made what would even now be admitted to be substantial progress. To whatever period the composition of the original works may ultimately be assigned, we cannot resist the conclusion that it must have been an age of marvellous energy and intellectual life; the effect produced by them, admitting them to be genuine works of ancient Babylonians, is absolutely startling. It is as though another Nineveh were disinterred—as though Babylon itself had cast off the accumulated deposits of ages, and risen from its ashes to claim its place in the history of the world.

It is not of course to be expected that such claims will be received without a most thorough sifting of the evidence by which they are maintained. Chwolson has already earned for himself a reputation which entitles him, at the least, to a patient and attentive hearing. His work on the Sabeans is regarded

by continental scholars as one of the most valuable contributions to the religious and literary history of Western Asia. There can be no doubt of his accuracy, learning, and genuine historic tact. Great expectations had been excited by the fact that he was engaged in investigating these documents, and by the notices of their contents which he communicated in his correspondence with Bunsen, Ewald, Movers, and Ernest Rénan. He has a reputation to lose. Should he succeed in establishing his own conclusion, that we have in these writings the remains of the ancient literature of Babylon, his name will stand high among those who have extended the sphere of historical investigation. Should he fail—should these works ultimately be regarded as spurious, or proved to be interpolated to any serious extent, he will scarcely escape the imputation of credulity or rashness. Reserving our own opinion until we have put our readers in possession of facts upon which they may form a deliberate judgment, we purpose in the following pages to give an account of the contents of the writings, and of the arguments which are adduced by Chwolson in maintaining their genuineness and antiquity.

The works, as is stated in the title-page, are professedly Arabic translations from old Babylonian writings. The manuscripts, which Chwolson used, belong to the University Library of Leyden, and were liberally placed at his disposal by the heads of that learned body. There are other MSS., more or less incomplete and corrupt, in many European libraries, and Professors of Oriental letters, among them Dr. Wright, Arabic Professor at Dublin, have supplied Chwolson with collations, and information upon several interesting points. Attention had been drawn to the singular value of the facts contained in these MSS. by Pürgstall Von Hammer, Ewald, and other Orientalists, and especially by M. Quatremère in the *Mémoire sur les Nabatéens*, published in the *New Asiatic Journal*, in 1835. That great scholar had not, however, more than one-third of the work before him at that time, nor had Ewald or any other Orientalist read the remaining portions, when Chwolson's treatise appeared. The most important and interesting facts which he has drawn from these sources were hitherto, so far as regards the European public, absolutely unknown.

Our first question must of course be how far we can depend upon the competency and good faith of the Arabic translators. It is satisfactory to find that here at any rate we rest upon firm historical ground. The two persons by whom the translations were made and published, were men whose character, position, and attainments leave no room for doubt as to their ability to accomplish the task, or the sufficiency of the motives

which induced them to undertake it. Abu Beker,¹ Ibn Wahshiyyah, lived in the beginning of the tenth century at Bagdad, the city which, under the auspices of Haroun al Rashid and his accomplished son, Al Mamoun, had become the centre of civilization and high literary culture. He was the head of a distinguished family, which traced its descent from the ancient Babylonians, a point to which he frequently refers with a melancholy pride. His forefathers appear to have remained heathens while their country was under the dominion of Christian emperors, and not until some years after the Mahometan invasion to have conformed, outwardly at least, to the religion of their Arabian conquerors. Al Kerim, his ancestor in the fourth degree, is evidently the first who bore a Mahometan name; the names of his preceding ancestors, Hareth, Nedina, Burâthabâ, Alâthiyâ are Chaldean. The family resided in the southern district of Babylonia, near the junction of the Tigris and Euphrates, in which there are still some half-heathenish remains of the same race, in the lowest state of ignorance and degradation. In that age they were still numerous, speaking their old language, though with many dialectic variations, and retaining the traditions of ancient grandeur. Many of them became Mahometans, and rose to high rank under the caliphs, but the mass of the population practised secretly the rites of their idolatrous ancestors. These Babylonians regarded their Mahometan masters with intense hatred, who on their part viewed them with a contempt only modified by a general belief in their great talents and possession of magic powers. Abu Beker, notwithstanding his own adherence to Islamism,² sympathized deeply with his countrymen. He made it the great object of his life to raise them in the estimation of the Arabians, an object which could not be more effectually attained than by proving that the ancient literature of his people possessed works of great intrinsic value on

¹ We shall call him by this name, as being familiar to European ears, and that which he generally uses when he has occasion to speak of himself. Chwolson and other Orientalists usually call him Ibn Wahshiyyah. His full eastern designation, which is of some importance, is Abu Beker Ahmed ben Ali, ben Keis, ben El Mochtâr, ben Abd El Kerim, ben Haritha, ben Nedina, ben Burathaba, ben Alathiya el Kasdani, i.e. the Chaldean, el Sufi, i.e. the Suffee, el Kassini, named Ibn Wahshiyyah.

² He seems to have been a sincere convert, but like many learned men of his age, he adopted the mystical views of the Suffees, which enabled him to profess Mahometanism and at the same time to retain a certain liberty of spirit. There was a good deal of what was called free thinking in that age; the Vizier of the contemporary Chaliph was suspected of infidelity, and many men of rank were put to death on the charge of Zendism, i.e. of philosophic or mystic heathenism. See Weil Geschichte der Khalipher, and the interesting history of the Chaliphs, by Al Fachri, lately published by Ahlwardt.

subjects of a scientific and practical character. He was a man of extensive learning, well acquainted with the various dialects of his own country; he wrote Arabic with fluency and elegance, understood Persian, and had read the chief works of the Greek philosophers, physicians, and mathematicians, either, as seems probable, in the original, or at least in the translations, which, during his lifetime, were made chiefly by Syrians, who, like his own ancestors, retained the religion as well as the cultivation of their forefathers. Abu Beker had travelled in Egypt, Persia, and India, and was conversant with many branches of natural history, a subject cultivated, as we shall see, with a genuine taste by his ancestors. At the meetings of the Suffees,¹ at once a literary and mystic sect, (to which, like many distinguished men connected by descent with Persian or Syrian heathenism, he was a staunch adherent,) he was in the habit of giving lectures, which seem to have excited a good deal of interest, on the philosophy and theology of the ancient Babylonians.

His wish to give a complete account of that literature could not be gratified without much difficulty. His own family may probably, like the Ephesian converts, have sacrificed their heathen books on their conversion, and they who still kept the old faith, jealously concealed their literary documents from Mahometans. He succeeded at last in discovering a large collection of ancient documents in the possession of a Chaldean, who could not, however, be induced to part with them, until Abu Beker, who spared no money or pains to secure this treasure, convinced him that the translation would redound to the glory of their common ancestors. Having obtained possession of them, he passed the latter years of his life, from 904 to 930 A.D., in preparing translations, in which he was assisted by his young compatriot Abu Talib, Ez Zayat, to whom we are indebted for their completion and publication. Ez Zayat was himself a person of rank, descended also from a Chaldean who was vizier to two Chaliphs, a distinguished poet, and the chief patron of the learned men who adorned the court of the Abbassides in the reigns of Motassim and Vathek.²

¹ For many curious facts on this point, hitherto little known, see Chwolson *Die Seabier*, and E. Rénan's '*Histoire des Langues Sémitiques*.' Plato, Aristotle, Euclid, Archimedes, Galen, &c., were translated by members of one great heathen family residing at Bagdad at that very time.

² In the Arabic history, *Al Fachri*, just published by Ahlwardt, we find many interesting particulars of this remarkable man. He was vizier to Motassim and Vathek, and cruelly tortured and put to death by the capricious tyrant Motawakkel. See *Abulfeda*, Ann. tom. ii. p. 185, ed. Reiske.

So far we have facts touching the translators of these documents about which there is no room for doubt. The circumstances are probable, the inducements sufficient, and their competency unquestionable; but we have, of course, to inquire how far we may depend upon their good faith and accuracy. One point, which Chwolson has left unnoticed, appears to us most important in this inquiry. Such documents as these could not have been forged, or materially interpolated, at that time without the certainty of detection. Among the compatriots of Abu Beker, living in the same social circle, were certain distinguished Syrians of high rank and influence at the Chaliph's court, who translated the chief works of Plato, Aristotle, Euclid, Archimedes, and Galen, and who also published in Syriac full accounts of the heathenish rites at that time still practised in northern Mesopotamia, and especially in Harran. Those men were bigoted adherents to heathenism, which they believed, in accordance with the tenets of the Neoplatonists, to have been the most powerful agency in advancing the civilization of the world. They were, of course, quite competent to judge of the authenticity of documents written in a dialect nearly allied to their own. It is impossible that they should have allowed Abu Beker to produce spurious writings like these, which give accounts of the old religion of the Babylonians differing in some points essentially from those which they had themselves maintained. They had the very strongest inducement to expose Abu Beker and his friend, both of whom were Mahometans, and had therefore no claim upon their forbearance. It is, moreover, highly improbable that such men, who were deeply interested in all philosophical and historical questions, and justly proud of their own character for accuracy and learning, should have connived at the publication of spurious works.

It must, on the other hand, be admitted that both Abu Beker and his colleague, had a strong interest in representing their discovery under the most favourable point of view. They were apologists, if not controversialists. They were, moreover, quite competent to introduce information of a practical and scientific character, such as would attract the attention of cultivated Arabians; nor would it be at all contrary to the customs or principles of literary men at that time to insert passages in order to explain unintelligible, or to complete imperfect documents. Even admitting the works to be substantially genuine, we might expect to find some corruptions, mistakes, or interpolations. Yet, if we may accept Chwolson's assertion, corroborated by a very copious selection of passages in Arabic, printed in his notes, it must be granted that there

are no indications of intentional falsification. The translator frequently explains or illustrates difficult passages, but in that case gives his name; he often observes that he does not understand the meaning of a passage in the original text, or know anything of the persons mentioned, or that the MSS. are illegible. He admits, also, that he sometimes substitutes modern names of places for those which were unintelligible or obsolete—a point to be well remembered by readers of this work. It is, moreover, obvious that he has not expunged a great number of passages, which, as he must have been well aware, would give serious offence, and excite the fanatic passions of Mahometans. We see no reason why he should wantonly have run the risk of being burnt, like some of his contemporaries, as a sorcerer,¹ or publisher of magic books. The events of a historical character, which are casually introduced, are, for the most part, such as no impostor would probably have invented. The names of some twenty Babylonian kings are mentioned, all of them unknown, with one singular exception, to be considered presently. There is an entire absence of attempts to harmonize such allusions with that strange system of ancient history which passed current with the Mahometans, and was intimately interwoven with their religious convictions, being derived from corrupt and mangled traditions of Judaism through the Koran. The first impression made upon the reader by those portions of the works which Chwolson sets before us, or of which he gives a full abstract, is, that to whatever age they may ultimately be assigned, the originals must have been productions of heathens wholly unaffected by Mahometan, Christian, or Hebrew doctrines, unacquainted with the civilization of the West, living in a world of their own, and moulded by influences altogether distinct from those which produced the great works of classical antiquity.

We proceed now to give some account of the actual contents of the original works. There are three complete treatises, each of considerable extent.

1. The treatise on Nabatean agriculture.
2. The treatise on poisons.
3. The book of the Babylonian Tenkelusha.

There are also some fragments from a work bearing the strange but characteristic title, 'The Book of the Mysteries of the Sun and Moon.'

Of these, by far the most interesting and valuable is the treatise on Nabatean agriculture. By the term 'Nabateans,' the Arabians of Abu Beker's time understood, in the first

¹ In fact his name went down to posterity tainted with the suspicion of sorcery.

place, the descendants from the original inhabitants of southern Babylonia, but in a wider sense they generally comprehended all the races of Aramean or Syriac origin, even including the Canaanites. This use of the word differs a good deal from that formerly received by Orientalists. It seems first to have been suggested by M. Quatremère, and has been conclusively established by Chwolson in his work on the Sabeans. In these old Babylonian documents the writer certainly includes all the races usually called Semitic, with the exception, perhaps, of the Arabians and Ethiopians. His object is to give an exact account of the agricultural science of the Chaldeans, who formerly occupied the countries extending from Holwan, on the north-east of the Tigris, to Bazra. The language in which the whole, or the greater part, of these treatises was originally written, was in all probability a pure and correct form of ancient Syriac. Such, at least, is the opinion of Chwolson and of En Nedim,¹ an early Arabian writer of considerable attainments, and sound judgment.

The treatise itself is very large, filling about 1,300 folio pages of manuscript. The Leyden MS. is stated by Chwolson to be in a very good condition, with the exception of forty pages which were missing. We have heard from a professor at S. Petersburg, that these pages have been lately found. The early Arabian writers quote the work frequently, but unfortunately with little regard to its bearings upon ancient history and practical science. In fact, one great reason why this and other writings which bore the name of Ibn Wahshiyyah were so long neglected by Orientalists was, that from the quotations of Easterns, and especially from the extracts in the *Porta Mosis* of Maimonides, they were led to believe that little was to be found in them but wild heathenish superstitions. The Mahometans appear generally to have regarded that writer as a teacher of forbidden arts.

From various incidental notices in the work, we get a very clear notion of the position and character of the original author. His name was Kuthami, a Chaldean of noble descent, who lived at Babylon. He had extensive landed possessions in different parts of the Babylonian territory; one of his estates was on the west of the Euphrates, in a district called Theizenabad, another on the east of the Tigris, at a place named

¹ In the *Fihrist*, a very interesting work of the tenth century, from which numerous extracts, giving curious information on the old forms of Syrian heathenism, are quoted by Chwolson in the second volume of '*Die Ssabier*.' See also some valuable remarks by M. E. Rénan, *Histoire des Langues Sémitiques*, p. 267. ed. 1858.

Bagerma, the Bethgarma of the Syrians. These estates were managed by agents, who were in the habit of visiting Babylon, and discussing questions, as well as of receiving his instructions on all matters regarding the cultivation of his property.

He was undoubtedly a man of sense and extensive information. The following anecdote throws some light upon his character, and is not a bad specimen of his easy and unaffected way of introducing facts and suggestions. He tells us that a woman who was employed in the cultivation of his vineyards in Syria, came to him with a long account of a dream, in which a tall, greyhaired old woman had appeared and instructed her what to do in order to stop a disease which had attacked the vine. Kuthami sends her back to his bailiff, a shrewd, clear-headed old fellow, who treats the dream with great contempt, and heals the vines by dressing and pruning according to the plan recommended by an old writer, Dhagrith, of whom more hereafter. He is quite successful, and is praised and rewarded by his master, who thoroughly appreciates his sagacity and good sense. This characteristic incident gives a fair idea of Kuthami's general way of dealing with prevalent superstitions, which he never openly opposes, but seldom allows to interfere with his own practical views. From other indications, we come to the conclusion that he was a mild, kindhearted, and liberal man, somewhat overcautious in political and religious matters, but honest withal, and truthful, especially in matters of literary or scientific interest. It is to be noted, that even in his time there were associations for literary or scientific purposes. He belonged himself to a certain school, which took its name from Kufa, or Kuka, a place which, by a singular coincidence, became a centre of religious learning in the early ages of Christendom.

The object of the treatise is directly and exclusively practical—to gather together in one great storehouse the accumulated results of ancient research and experience on all matters connected with the cultivation of the soil. It is, so to speak, the agricultural encyclopædia of the Babylonians. The writer begins with what appears to have been a customary and indispensable, but in his case, probably, little more than a formal compliance with the superstitions of his age and country. Saturn, or Zohal, the deity who, according to some of the oldest legends of the Cushite and Semitic races, had his dwelling, or visible embodiment in the planet which bears his name, was specially adored as the god of agriculture, the efficient cause of the growth, and also of the decay, of all vegetable existence. Kuthami represents this being as communicating the secrets contained in this book to the moon, the mystic revealer of

occult truths,¹ who discloses them through the medium of her image to the author.

The treatise proceeds at once to the cultivation of the olive, which takes the first rank amongst plants, partly because of its great value and longevity, and partly by reason of its special consecration to Saturn. Eight chapters follow on the most important of all agricultural topics to a Mesopotamian, that of irrigation—full, as Chwolson tells us, of practical information on wells, canals, water-engines, and tests for ascertaining the purity and wholesomeness of springs, &c. Next, thirty-three chapters on garden-trees, a genuine Babylonian taste, reminding us of the hanging gardens of Semiramis. Many trees appear to have been cultivated merely for ornament; others are mentioned, bearing a variety of fruits, such as nuts, almonds, oranges, and pistaccios. We have then some advice about the management of landed property, not unworthy of attention in any age. The master should be gentle, frank, and friendly in his intercourse with his tenants; detailed instructions are given for the best arrangement of villages, and especially for the construction of houses in which the labourers may be kept in good health; sanitary rules, which modern commissioners would gladly have the power of enforcing. Bailiffs and stewards are told how to conduct themselves: not to tell lies,² not to waste time in idle talk, and above all, to give an example to the labourers of strict fulfilment of religious duties.

Then come chapters on the prognostics of rain, fit times for sowing, an agricultural calendar, astronomical tables prepared by certain Canaanites, Tamithri, and Cerdana; influences of temperature and of the planets on the growth of herbs; full and accurate observations on the properties of the soil, on different kinds of manure, and on the best way of clearing the ground of weeds. There are fifteen chapters on the cultivation of cereals, the characteristic produce of Babylonia in the time of Herodotus, sixty-six on kitchen gardens, and a special chapter on wheat and bread-making. Then follow some very curious physiological speculations upon the causes of the pro-

¹ Hence the title, Prophet of the Moon, borne in this book by Adami, the first great teacher of agricultural science, and also by certain Egyptian priests. See Brugsch, *Histoire d'Egypte*, p. 133.

On the connexion between image-worship and the planets, Chwolson has collected a vast number of interesting facts in his work on the Sabeans.

² This advice of Kuthami's rises above the level of common-place, if we adopt the very probable interpretation given by Levi, in his *Phœni-zische Studien*, of a name on a Babylonian gem in the British Museum, undoubtedly belonging to early heathenish times, אכדבן the liar, as an epithet of praise, equivalent to a shrewd, clever man, a Chaldean Ulysses.

duction, growth, and characteristic peculiarities of plants. The cultivation of the vine¹ occupies three long chapters; there are curious accounts of the flora of the desert, of trees valuable for timber, and, as might be expected, a special treatise on the palm. The work ends with a general recapitulation, and with a reference to a supplementary work, unknown to the translator, on the management of domestic animals, a point to which attention was directed at a very early age. In fact, the sculptures on the tomb of Chnoum-hotep, a noble of the twelfth Egyptian dynasty, far more ancient than Kuthami, show considerable skill in the treatment of cattle, including veterinary operations.²

We have not as yet the means of ascertaining the exact value of these facts and suggestions, and must reserve a final judgment until the entire treatise has been published. But we cannot doubt that the writer was a man of sound attainments and acute observation. We have, moreover, the testimony of a very competent judge as to the philosophical and scientific character of the book. E. Meyer³ concludes that the author must have lived in an age far advanced in scientific research. He finds in this treatise 'A system of arboriculture and agriculture, based upon a physical foundation, starting from general principles, and proceeding step by step, even to the minutest detail, of each cultivated plant, its growth and uses, while no wild plant is omitted which can be turned to account.' From this he draws the inference, that the whole book must have been derived from classical sources, a point which Chwolson controverts with great ability. We must at any rate accept the conclusion, that the scientific character of the treatise is not the result of interpolation, and consider that the authority of M. Meyer is conclusive as to its intrinsic value. But the preceding account conveys after all but an inadequate idea of the multifarious contents of this treatise. The author takes occasion in describing agricultural operations to give explanatory accounts of the circumstances under which various plants were first brought to Babylon, and of the persons by whom practical and scientific improvements were introduced. He thus presents us with most curious and interesting views of events, customs, and personages hitherto unknown; while incidentally, and in the most natural manner, he gives a deep insight into the social habits, the philosophical speculations, and the

¹ According to Herodotus, the vine did not grow in Babylonia, but, as we have seen, Kuthami's estates lay in other districts.

² See Brugsch, *Histoire d'Egypte*, p. 61.

³ *Geschichte der Botanik*, 1856. The book is quoted very often by Chwolson.

religious systems of his own and preceding ages. A brief inquiry into the sources from which he professes to derive his information brings us at once into contact with names and facts of a singularly interesting nature.

Kuthami does not profess to write a new book, and claims no credit for originality of views; on the contrary, he says distinctly, that his object is simply to present the facts and speculations of ancient writers in a complete and systematic form. In one characteristic and important passage he speaks thus of his own relative position. 'It is possible that at some future time a writer more ingenious and intellectual than myself may raise agronomical science to a higher state of advancement. As Dhagrith in his time wrote on agricultural matters, and Janbushad, though he did not compose an original work, added many suggestions and discoveries of his own, thus, in my own time, I have studied much and written much, and, without putting myself on a footing of equality with them, may claim the merit of correcting their observations, and supplying additional information on points which I have myself ascertained.' We have therefore before us a work in which all the results of Babylonian experience, on what then was the most important of all subjects, are collected and completed up to Kuthami's age. So far we may accept his statements without hesitation.

Dhagrith and Janbushad, two persons hitherto unknown, lived long before Kuthami, and are asserted by him to have built their system upon foundations laid ages before their time. In the remotest antiquity certain persons, as we are told by Kuthami, were venerated not only as inventors or discoverers, but as writers of systematic treatises in natural philosophy. Dewânai,¹ the most ancient legislator and teacher of religion in Babylonia, did not write a treatise specially on agriculture, but in works chiefly of a religious character he recorded many curious facts, and left drawings of the vine, with explanations, one of which is fully described by Kuthami.

The real founder of agricultural science, and the special object of Kuthami's reverence, was Adami. Few of his writings were preserved in Kuthami's time, but even then they were interpolated and corrupted. His religious system is said to have been monotheistic, not however without an admixture of what, from other sources, we have reason to believe was the oldest form of superstition. He is elsewhere called the Prophet of the Moon, which, as we have seen, was supposed to be the

¹ The name reminds us of Dewaniyeh, a favourite residence of the Turkish governor of the district.

mediator between the Supreme Intelligence and man. His science was based upon close observation of natural processes, and directed to practical objects, but, as we might expect, was mixed up with a good deal of superstition and extravagance. He was the originator of what is called natural magic, a system proceeding from the principle that natural phenomena may be artificially reproduced when the causes are thoroughly understood. It is very curious to find that some of the wildest speculations of modern physiologists were thus anticipated, and that experiments of such a nature amused the leisure of learned Babylonians in those days of hoar antiquity. Kuthami, who recognised the Baconian principle, that every theory should be brought to the test of experiment, tells us that he followed Adami's instructions closely, and attempted to produce plants, or varieties of plants, by artificial combinations. The experiments, as he admits, generally failed—a fact which he attributes to the carelessness of his servants or to errors in the old and half-intelligible treatise. Adami's influence is represented as having been on the whole most beneficial to mankind. The forms of worship which he commended were simple and patriarchal, and social duties were kept in their right place.

The name 'Adami,' of course suggests some objections. It looks very much like a corrupt tradition—a point which we will consider presently:—here we may remark, that the Arabic translator was not likely to have given needless offence to those whom he wished to conciliate, by a wanton contradiction of the oldest authentic records of mankind. We cannot believe that he *invented* this name.

The son of Adami is a still more extraordinary personage. Kuthami regards him with a peculiar antipathy, and even with hatred, feelings with which Chwolson has a strong and amusing sympathy. Humanity is said to have owed to his influence, directly or indirectly, thousands of years of dark and miserable superstition. If not the inventor of star worship, astrology, magic rites, and incantations, &c., he is said to have been the first who reduced all such superstitions to a system. The religion which he thus founded was henceforth dominant in Babylonia, and extended thence through Mesopotamia and Syria, perhaps to the remotest countries with which Babylon was connected by commercial intercourse. We find, however, that there remained a liberal party in Babylon, to which Kuthami belonged, who, although they conformed outwardly to Ishitha's system, preferred the older and more simple faith; while others boldly threw off all profession of religion, scoffed at the asserted influence of the planets, and even denied the existence of the gods. We are struck by the singular coinci-

dence of this representation with early well-known Indian speculations—speculations which make it less incredible that the phenomena of later religious development should have been anticipated in that prehistoric, if not mythical, age. We remember, also, with some misgiving, that Abu Beker had travelled in India for the express purpose of making himself acquainted with the traditional lore of that land.

Passing over other names which may in time become familiar even to English ears, we have two distinct and interesting types of character in Dhagrith¹ and Janbushad. The former was a man of strict conservative principles, an orthodox observer of times and seasons, and, to use Chwolson's apt germanism, 'of strict heathenish religiosity.' The first points of consideration with him were the courses of the planets and their occult influences. He was withal a man of a gentle, kindly, and social nature, just and liberal in his views, the type of a warm-hearted country gentleman before political economy and popular science damaged the race. His works, which were pretty numerous, were all written in verse, and were scarcely intelligible in Kuthami's time. He was, in fact, the Hesiod of old Babylonia, a didactic poet, taking for his themes natural history, times, seasons, and popular theology. Janbushad, according to Chwolson one of the most remarkable personages of the ancient world, stands out in striking contrast to this old gentleman. He professed an open antagonism to the national superstitions. He kept none of the festivals, did not frequent the temples of the gods, and publicly denied the influence of the planets and, as a matter of course, their divinity. At the same time he secured the respect and reverence of his countrymen, by a singularly austere, self-denying, and industrious life: all his time was occupied with physiological speculations upon the growth of plants, and upon the causes upon which their colour, taste, and physical peculiarities depend. He was evidently a most exact and intelligent observer of nature, and Kuthami refers to him as the chief authority for the most striking and original facts and inferences recorded in his book.

We have thought it necessary, even at the risk of tediousness, to bring these uncouth names and strange characters before our readers. They best show what is the nature of this remarkable treatise, which seems to us equally difficult to be accounted for, whether we suppose it to be a forgery of the tenth century or a genuine document of the remotest antiquity. Chwolson is

¹ This name may remind us of Tagrith, a very ancient city, well known as the birthplace of Saladin, situate between Mosul and Bagdad.

quite satisfied that the work in its present shape was undoubtedly written by Kuthami, nor do M. Quatremère, Von Hammer, or even Ewald, entertain any doubts as to its authenticity. In considering the evidences for or against this assumption, and in determining the age at which it was probably written, we must bear in mind the admitted fact, that the Arabian translators freely introduce facts and explanations; and also, that interpolations of various kinds may have been inserted by Chaldean transcribers during the long period which must have elapsed before it came into their hands.

We may now proceed to the all-important question, to what age may the original documents be reasonably assigned. The date can of course be determined only by approximation—there are no positive chronological data in this or in any of the treatises. M. Quatremère, who had read about one-third of this work, has recorded his decided opinion that it bears indisputable marks of high antiquity; in fact, that it must have been written long before the fall of Babylon, during or before the reign of Nebuchadnezzar. Chwolson, as we shall see, fixes a still earlier date. This is his course of reasoning. First, there is not the least indication that the writer, who refers frequently to various forms of religion in the East, had ever heard of Christianity. Chwolson concludes that it could not have been written later than the first or second century of our epoch. It is further evident, that the author knew absolutely nothing of the Hebrew religion, which must have attracted his attention had he lived after the captivity. From that time there were always numerous Jews resident in Babylon, who spoke Kuthami's own language, were on terms of intimacy with his people, and held those monotheistic tenets to which he was certainly inclined. There are many places in this treatise which would have suggested a reference to the Jewish religion and nation had they been known to the author. Again, there is no allusion to the Arsacidæ, nor to the Persian sovereigns of Babylonia. Again, the author names not less than twenty-two Babylonian kings, each of them in connexion with some important event. Not one of these names belongs to a dynasty posterior to Nebuchadnezzar, nor can it be demonstrated, according to Chwolson, that any customs, events, or circumstances belong to that, or of course to a later, age. From these negative arguments it is inferred, that the writer probably lived before that king. The positive arguments are still more striking. The writer represents himself as living in Babylon at a time when the inhabitants were rich and prosperous, the surrounding districts in a high state of cultivation, and the city itself the most civilized and magnificent in the world. The tone of the

entire composition harmonizes with this statement; it is bright, cheerful, evidently that of a rich man satisfied with his position, and with abundant opportunities of gratifying his tastes for expensive luxuries and learned investigations. The following passage may exemplify his general way of speaking about Babylon:—‘All men, from all quarters of the earth, look on our people with envy, and come to this land that they may acquire all kinds of information, and be instructed by us in the fine arts. They follow our fashions in dress, decorations, and in general habits. In fact, the people of Babylon are; so to speak, gods to all men in all the earth.’ Such an assertion could scarcely have been made by the most enthusiastic Babylonian at any period after the capture of the city by Cyrus, while it accords thoroughly with the representations of its wealth, art, and productions on the monuments of Egypt at an age far more ancient than that of Nebuchadnezzar.

The first impression would naturally be, that Kuthami may have lived under the Assyrian dynasty immediately preceding that of Nebuchadnezzar, and such was the conclusion to which M. Quatremère arrived. Upon fuller inquiry, Chwolson pronounces that the internal evidence is incompatible with that hypothesis. One of the most unexpected and interesting facts in the book is, that the writer represents the Chaldeans, to whom he himself belonged, and the Assyrians, who at a previous epoch had ruled over the land, as being on terms of bitter enmity. It is clear from many notices in his treatise, that although the bulk of the Assyrian population and the Chaldeans were descended from common ancestors—a view which agrees with the notices in Genesis—the kings and nobles belonged altogether to a different race, probably of Arian, if not of Turanian origin. They were certainly not the masters of Babylon when Kuthami wrote. He expresses his hatred of them in no measured terms; in a way, indeed, which, considering his calm and prudent, not to say time-serving character, is unaccountable, save on the supposition that he had no fear of their restoration to power. This representation, so wholly unlike what a later writer could have invented, or have expected to be received as probable at any time after the era of Nebuchadnezzar, whose name and glory are attested by every brick in Babylon, appears to us one of the most convincing evidences of the genuineness of the work.

The next point is of a still stranger and more startling character. Kuthami states facts in many passages of the book which show that he lived under a CANAANITISH dynasty. He was contemporary with the fifth or sixth sovereign of that dynasty. There cannot be any doubt as to this being his statement.

Ewald, who fully admits the importance of this result, was inclined to suppose that the passages which refer to Canaanites must have belonged to those portions of the book which were written at a far more ancient time, by Dhagrith or Janbushad. He had not the work before him, and Chwolson proves that Kuthami speaks of his own time. Chwolson is quite aware of the novelty, strangeness, and at first sight the incredibility, of the statement. He says, 'No one hitherto has had the remotest suspicion that a Canaanitish dynasty ever reigned in 'Babylon.'

The Canaanites of Kuthami are undoubtedly the same whom we understand by that name. He speaks of them as coming from the remotest parts of Syria; and in giving an account of the introduction of the cherry-tree into Babylonia, he says that it was indigenous on the Jordan, in the land of the Canaanites. He may have included other tribes, or on the other hand, have given a general designation to one particular tribe, but he certainly meant the Canaanites of Palestine.¹

The relations between the princes of this dynasty and their Chaldean subjects are represented as not altogether hostile. The notices, which are very numerous, convey the impression that the Canaanites may have displaced a race more odious to the natives, and more unlike to them in habits and cultivation. Still there is a manifest rivalry between the Chaldeans and the Canaanites, who, although far from being an uncivilized or uneducated people, were evidently inferior to their subjects in mental cultivation and the refinements of social life. The first king of the dynasty thoroughly distrusts his people, and upon slight provocation, menaces a large number of them with extermination. Kuthami, however, always speaks cautiously and respectfully of the conquerors, and recognises their merits as successful warriors, and also as able governors. He mentions many Canaanitish writers who had thrown light upon departments of natural science in which he was interested, and while he vigorously maintains the intellectual superiority of his own countrymen, evidently feels that he is dealing with adversaries at once formidable for their power, and entitled to respectful

¹ Kitto says, that the cherry-tree was unknown to the Hebrews, but simply on the ground that it was unknown to Rauwolf in the sixteenth century. Of course its mention in this treatise would only *prove* that it was common in Mesopotamia in the tenth century; but it was well known in the north of Syria, and the districts bordering on the upper coasts of the Jordan, long before Rauwolf's age. Ibn Batoutah, who visited that country, A. D. 1326, speaks with the genuine taste of an oriental gourmand of the cherries of Baalbek as the best and most abundant in the world. We think it not improbable that the כנא of holy writ may be the cherry-tree, so called from the abundance of gum oozing from its bark.

Freytag mentions the כנא but does not tell us what plant is thus designated.

consideration for their attainments and talents. We feel the truth of the position, which strikingly resembles that of the Greeks under the Roman emperors, of the Anglo-Saxons under the Norman successors of the Conqueror, and also, it must be admitted, that of the two translators of the original documents under their Arabian masters. We feel the possibility that the colouring may have been tinged by their strong prepossessions. Still there is throughout these notices so strong an air of reality ; — the allusions, which occur incidentally, and always with some sufficient reason, are so natural and unaffected, that we are not disposed to admit the probability of any extensive interpolation. It is quite clear that no Chaldean writer, who looked back with proud satisfaction to the ancient glory of his nation, would have invented such a state of humiliation ; it is not less clear that Abu Beker and his coadjutor, whose direct and avowed object it was to prove the claims of their remote ancestors to the respect and admiration of the Arabians, would not gratuitously have represented them as being subject to a Canaanitish race, which to the minds of the readers of the Koran was at once odious and contemptible. They must have been well aware that such a statement would be regarded as strange and incredible by those of their contemporaries who were most conversant with historical traditions, while it could not possibly subserve the cause which lay nearest to their hearts.

Chwolson meets the objection, which, of course, occurs to every reader, that ancient history makes no mention of a connexion between the Canaanites and Babylon, with some striking, and, on the whole, not unsatisfactory remarks. He lays much stress upon the fact, that the prophet Ezekiel, who passed a great part of his life in Babylon, used the terms Canaan and Babylon as synonymous—c. xvi. 19—‘ To the land of Canaan, towards Chaldea ;’ an expression of which no interpreter has been able to give an explanation, but which becomes quite intelligible if we admit a prolonged occupation of Chaldea by Canaanites. There are also, as he proves, many indications in ancient legends, hitherto overlooked or misunderstood, which point to a connexion between these nations, not founded upon an original relationship, but implying an emigration of Canaanites from Babylonia, and a return at some later period. Thus, the Babylonians represent the Canaanites as derived from their own tutelary deity, Bel Kronos ; while, on the other hand, the Phœnicians have a legend that their own national god emigrated to Babylon, and took up his residence there. These statements, the importance of which will be recognised by ethnologists, fully harmonize with the facts noted in this treatise, that the Canaanites had been expelled from

Babylonia at some remote period; that, in opposition to the old Chaldeans, Jupiter, *i.e.* the presiding deity of the planet then called Mosheri, was the special object of their worship, and that the Babylonians adopted this and other superstitions after the date of the Canaanitish invasion. There are also many references to primeval settlements of Phœnicians, *i.e.* Canaanites, on the islands and coasts of the Persian Gulf, and traditions of desperate struggles in or about the sixteenth century before Christ. These points are fully proved by Movers, who was, however, unable to reconcile them with the then known facts of ancient history. Chwolson attaches some importance to the old legends, which make the mythological Cepheus sometimes a Babylonian, sometimes a Palestinian prince, and finds an intermediate link in the Hivites, who, together with the children of Heth, are proved, both by Scriptural statements and Egyptian monuments, to have been the ruling race in the federated states of Canaan at the time of the Israelitish invasion. Some passages in Mahometan authors, more ancient than Abu Beker, imply that there was an early tradition of a Canaanitish dynasty in Babylon. These statements may be inconclusive, but they meet the objection, that *all* historical evidence is opposed to the representations in this work. The fact that such notices are scanty, obscure, and hitherto have been almost wholly disregarded, by no means militates against the authenticity of documents, which alone enable us to combine them in a rational and intelligible narrative.

If we accept the statement, we have to answer the very difficult question, at what time, and under what circumstances Babylonia can have been conquered by a Canaanitish race.

Chwolson, who, as we are glad to observe, accepts the Biblical chronology, and repudiates the speculations of modern rationalists, comes, as we should have expected, to the conclusion, that there is no place for such an event after the invasion and conquest of Canaan by the Israelites. We rest in this conclusion, although we feel that the question is not absolutely settled. There were very powerful states of Canaanitish descent in the neighbourhood, or even in partial possession of Palestine, long after that epoch. Even in the age of the early kings, the princes of the Hittites were able to maintain their independence, both in antagonism to the Israelites and to their Egyptian neighbours; and it does not seem quite impossible that they may, on some occasion unknown to us, have invaded Babylonia. Still the absence of all historical notice, during a period when written records were certainly preserved, gives great weight to Chwolson's conclusion, considering the importance of such an event to the Hebrews.

Chwolson proceeds further to argue that the occupation of

Babylonia could not have been a consequence of that invasion. He argues that, if the Canaanites had been strong enough to conquer Babylonia at that time, they would of course have remained at home, and offered a more prolonged and vigorous resistance to the Israelites. This, however, is scarcely conclusive. We do not see that it is wholly unreasonable to suppose that there may have been an armed emigration of large bodies of Canaanites, under the influence of such a panic as we know prevailed among them on the approach of Joshua. The large army collected at a later time, on the north of Palestine, by Jabin, the only Canaanitish conqueror of Israel mentioned in Holy Scripture, proves that the power of that people was not quite broken, although their energies were paralyzed for the time; nor does it seem improbable that a larger force, especially one consisting chiefly of armed chariots,¹ arriving in Babylonia, at a junction when the Assyrians were weakened by internal dissensions, should have succeeded in expelling them, with the assistance or connivance of the native population.

We proceed, however, to consider the highly ingenious and interesting hypothesis finally adopted by Chwolson. Assuming as the fact, that a dynasty of Canaanites did reign in Babylon, the question arises whether it can be identified with any of the dynasties of which we have accounts in Berosus, or the chronologers who have preserved the relics of his writings. It is now admitted that Berosus had ample opportunities of learning the ancient history of his nation. From Kuthami's writings, it is evident, that the old Babylonians had a very important and highly developed historical literature; he mentions incidentally a general history of the world, histories of various nations and cities, biographies of distinguished men, and monographies on individual kings. At present, also, historians consider that reliance may be placed upon the statements of Berosus, excepting where there is reason to suppose that they have been intentionally falsified by later compilers: a supposition which does not affect the early portion of his annals. We are met at once with the formidable difficulty that Berosus does not mention Canaanites at all among the old sovereigns of the land. He gives an account of six dynasties, ending with the biblical Phul, the predecessor of Sennacherib, according to Polyhistor, from whom Africanus, and through Africanus, Eusebius, derived their information. It is certain that the Canaanites could not belong to the first dynasty, which was mythical, or the second, which was of Median origin, the third, which belongs to a far earlier

¹ The cavalry of the Hittites consisted of chariots drawn by two horses, and carrying each three warriors. They are frequently represented on the monuments of Karnac, erected to commemorate the Asiatic expeditions of Sethos I.

age than can be admitted, or the fourth, which is expressly called Chaldean. The fifth dynasty is known as the Arabian. It continued 245 years, under nine kings, whose names, to which we shall presently have occasion to refer, are given by Syncellus. The dynasty was succeeded by Shamirami, or Semiramis. It continued from 1520 to 1275 B.C. Chwolson, whose conclusion is adopted by the Chevalier Bunsen, and defended by him with his usual ingenuity, and a good deal of his not unusual impetuosity, holds this to have been the dynasty under which Kuthami lived; a conclusion for which he assigns the following reasons:—

Berosus wrote his work expressly for the information of the Greeks; and when he found any names which would either be unintelligible to them, or convey a false impression, he would naturally substitute one which they would understand, provided, of course, that it was substantially accurate. This observation applies directly to the Canaanites, who were scarcely known to the Greeks under that designation. Berosus could not call them Syrians, a name by which his own countrymen, and the Greeks of his time, would understand altogether a different race, or Phœnicians, a name which was then limited to the inhabitants of the well-known district on the Mediterranean. But he might call Canaanites Arabians without any grave historical error, since the two races were nearly connected by blood, the Himyarites, and, indeed, most of the tribes in the south of the Arabian peninsula, being Cushites by descent, and still more so by language, customs, and religion, in which both Arabians and Canaanites differed widely from the Chaldeans. This substitution of names is the more probable, since, as we shall see, there is good reason to believe that the mass of the invading force consisted of Arabian tribes, under the guidance of Canaanitish chieftains.

We now come to an historical combination, which presents so many striking coincidences, that it seems impossible to reject it as merely fortuitous. The Hyksos were expelled from Egypt about the same time, according to the calculations of most chronologists, at which this Arabian, or Canaanitish dynasty is represented to have acquired possession of Babylon. Now, in his work on the Sabeans,¹ Chwolson some years ago, of course without any reference to the present subject, arrived at the conclusion that at an early epoch certain Semitic tribes, chiefly Assyrians, were expelled from northern Mesopotamia by an invasion of Arians. Advancing into Babylonia, these tribes expelled other races, some of Arabian, some of Canaan-

¹ Vol. i. p. 319.

itish origin, and established the early Assyrian dominion. These Canaanites and Arabians, in their turn, traversed the deserts to the west of Babylonia, then collected numerous forces of kindred tribes, and overran the whole of Egypt, where they remained some hundreds of years. We find a general agreement among ancient writers, that the Hyksos, or shepherd kings, were either Arabians or Phoenicians; modern historians are satisfied that the mass were Arabians, while old Egyptian traditions, preserved in Arabic translations, which, according to Chwolson, have hitherto been strangely neglected by Egyptian antiquaries, designate the invaders as Amalekites, Syrians, or *Canaanites*. This view accords with many notices and certain historical facts. The chief of the Hyksos bore a name, Salatis, which is evidently of Semitic, and probably of Canaanitish origin. It is evident from the accounts of Manetho,¹ that the Assyrian empire, which soon became one of the most powerful in the world, was on hostile terms with the Hyksos, who fortified the north-east frontier of Egypt to protect themselves from invasion, and especially from their enterprising neighbours. When, therefore, after a long series of contests, the Hyksos were at length driven out, what is more probable than that they should return to their old habitations? Most of the Arabians probably remained in the deserts adjoining Egypt, and carried on a desultory warfare, in which they were generally worsted, with the powerful monarchs of the eighteenth and following Egyptian dynasties. The most enterprising warlike tribes, under the guidance of the Canaanites, who, as the more intelligent, cultivated, and nobler race, gave their name to the whole force, may, without any stretch of imagination, be supposed to have advanced into Babylonia, and, after a severe contest, to have made themselves masters of the country. This conjecture is supported by many curious and unquestionable facts. We find the Egyptian kings engaged from that time in continued struggles with the Mesopotamians, who are always mentioned in connexion with the Sasous, the Egyptian designation of the Hyksos, on the one hand, and the Canaanites, or the Cheta, *i.e.* Hittites, on the other; in fact, the three names would seem to be indiscriminately used on some monuments which record the triumphs of Sethos I. A.C. 1458.² Among the nations who were conquered in that expedition against the Hyksos, are enumerated the shepherds of Asia, *i.e.* the Bedouins, the Cheta, or Hittites, *i.e.* Canaan-

¹ See Josephus c. Apion, 1, cxiv.

² See the second tablet on the outer wall of the great hall of the Temple of Ammon at Karnac, and the descriptions of M. Brugsch, in his 'Reiseberichten,' and in his 'Histoire d'Egypte,' vol. i. p. 128.

ites, Naharina, *i. e.* Mesopotamia, the Routen, or Assyrians; and the Pount, or Arabians of Cushite descent. The remains of Egyptian art, which are numerous in the ruins of Nineveh, dating from that very age, are sufficiently accounted for, on the supposition that the Assyrian empire was under the Hyksos, who, of course, brought with them the arts and productions of Egypt. We have also to remember that the Egyptians adopted Canaanitish forms of worship, which appear on their monuments, for the first time, just after the occupation of their land by the Hyksos, and especially the worship of deities which were common to the Babylonians and Phœnicians, such as Baal and Ashtaroth; thus, on a monument at Memphis, about the time assigned on this hypothesis to Kuthami, we find mention of a prophet of the moon, and of Ashtaroth, queen of the two worlds, designations which find striking parallels in this treatise. It may be objected that the description of the Canaanites, given by Kuthami, scarcely agrees with the notices of the Hyksos in Egyptian writers, who represent them as fierce and uncivilized barbarians; but the discrepancy is easily accounted for, considering the national prejudices of the Egyptians, and the probability that the ravages which excited such deep and lasting hatred, were committed by the Arabian plunderers, who fought under the banners of the Canaanitish chieftains; while, on the other hand, Kuthami was not likely to use expressions which could give unnecessary offence to his sovereign. There are, moreover, abundant reasons to believe that the civilization of the Canaanites was at that time such as would fully bear out the representations of Kuthami. Among the Canaanites, who are expressly named on Egyptian monuments of the fifteenth century, are generals, nobles, charioteers, and Chiaspar, *writer of books*, 'sans doute,' to use Brugsch's words, 'quelque littérateur de la primitive Asie.' If we accept the general opinion, that the Pharaoh of Joseph was a Hyksos, we have, of course, sufficient evidence of the high civilization of the aristocracy and sovereigns of that race. Upon the whole, we feel that Chwolson has, to say the least, made it highly probable that Kuthami's representation, which at first sight appeared irreconcilable with historical documents, is thoroughly to be depended upon, that it harmonizes singularly with facts recorded on the monuments of Egypt, and throws a new light on some of the most difficult and perplexing portions of the history of ancient Asia. We feel that Chwolson is justified in the conclusion, which is in entire accordance with biblical chronology, 'that the Canaanitish dynasty in Babylon is identical with the fifth dynasty of Berossus, which commenced about 1540 B.C. and ended

‘not earlier than 1295, and not later than 1273 : and therefore, that Kuthami, who was, as we have seen, contemporary with the fifth or sixth king of the dynasty, must have lived towards the beginning of the thirteenth century before the Christian era.’

The next point which we have to consider is far more strange, and even startling, and we must admit that if it were not capable of a very satisfactory explanation, it is one which, to the minds of English readers, would present insurmountable obstacles to the reception of the work. The name of the leader of this Canaanitish invasion was Nimrod; Kuthami, who lived some hundred years after him, and gives us a very lively representation of his wild, impetuous, but not ungenerous character, calls him Nemroda, the Chaldean form of the name. Our first impression on meeting this name, was that the translator, Abu Beker, or his able colleague, Ez Zayat, might have substituted it for another similar in form and signification, but unlikely to attract observation or excite interest. We were the more inclined to this view on finding that the first three sovereigns of the Arabian, *i.e.* on Chwolson’s hypothesis, the Canaanitish dynasty, bore names obviously derived from the same root as that of Nimrod, viz. Mardokentes, Mardocas, and Sisimardocas, a fact recorded by Syncellus, but which does not appear to have come under Chwolson’s notice. The first of these names, moreover, seemed to us, not impossibly, to have been equivalent to Mard, or Marod, or Meroda, the Canaanite. At a later date we find a correspondence between the great Egyptian king, Rameses Miamun, and a Babylonian with a not dissimilar name, Maresiri probably a corruption of Mardosiri. The name of Merodach Baladan will, of course, occur to most readers. On a curious Babylonian gem in the British Museum, one of the very few relics of ancient Babylonia with a Semitic inscription, we meet with two names, about the form of which no doubt can be entertained, that of a courtier named Gebrod, and of a god, Merod, or Marod; both names might, of course, be associated with the founder of an ancient dynasty. These facts appeared to us extremely valuable as corroborative evidences of the general truth of Kuthami’s statements, and, at the same time, as making it probable that the name was slightly modified, either by later Chaldean transcribers, or by the Arabian translators. Another hypothesis, however, suggested itself, which, on the whole, appears far more satisfactory, and which we have lately found supported by a most striking historical coincidence. It is not at all improbable that the chieftain of a mixed army, in which the leading race, and probably the great majority, were Cushites,

should have borne or adopted a name so illustrious in the early annals of that family. It seems to us so probable, that if we were convinced that no alteration had been made in the name, we should not have considered its occurrence a real difficulty. But we have, in the first place, an ancient tradition, originating certainly in that country, that the kings of the Nabateans, *i. e.* of the inhabitants of Southern Babylonia, in old times bore the name of Nimrod,¹ while other traditions speak of Nimrod as the first king of the old Chaldeans; we are rather surprised that Chwolson should not have seen the bearing of this statement upon his argument. Of still more importance, however, is the following consideration, resting upon the unquestioned authority of existing monuments. The twenty-second Egyptian dynasty has been shown by Lepsius, Brugsch, and other antiquarians, proceeding of course upon grounds altogether unconnected with the subject we are now discussing, to have been of foreign, and probably of Assyrian origin. The names of the kings of this dynasty are undoubtedly Semitic. It is believed that the ancestors of the family were brought into Egypt as captives from Assyria by one of the monarchs who, as we have seen, made successful excursions into the country occupied by their old enemies the Hyksos. The prisoners must have been treated with consideration by their conquerors, since Sesonchis, or as he is called in Egyptian monuments, Sasank, the Shishak of Holy Writ, succeeded to the throne, as it is presumed, not without strong evidence,² in right of his mother, an Egyptian princess. Now, among the names of the princes of this dynasty, the brothers or near relations of the monarchs, the *name of Nimrod occurs no less than three times* in a few generations. The father of Sesonchis himself was a Nimrod; the brother, and the second son of Osorkon II. both bear the same name, with the rank of high priest. This remarkable coincidence, which, as we are somewhat surprised to find, has escaped the observation of Chwolson, appears to us quite conclusive as to the high probability of the conjecture that the name was borne by many sovereigns, and that it may have been that by which the first Canaanitish conqueror of Babylon was designated. Chwolson, however, we regret to say, for we regard it as a conclusion which indicates some want of judgment, identifies this Canaanitish conqueror with 'the mighty hunter,' the son of Cush—a supposition which of itself would almost suffice to overthrow all belief

¹ Thus Hamawi, in the *Tarich el Mansuri*, quoted by Chwolson, in his work on the Sabeans, vol. i. p. 701. See also Abulfarage, H. D. p. 72.

² See Brugsch, *Histoire d'Egypte*, p. 221.

in the authenticity of the documents which should justify such a view. We see absolutely no grounds for adopting it; but we may admit that, in discussing the point, Chwolson has rendered good service in proving that some notions usually associated with that name have no foundation in the Scriptural narrative, but are derived from Rabbinical and Mahometan¹ traditions. The Bible does not name Nimrod as the builder of Babel, or as in any way connected with events which led to the confusion of tongues, and the dispersion of mankind. He shows that the Scriptural narrative is quite compatible with the view that Nimrod conquered first Babylon, then Erech, Accad, and Calneh. The Bible certainly does not say that he founded those cities, nor is it credible that they should have sprung into existence within the lifetime of a single monarch. It may be added that Genesis x. 11, which presents so many difficulties to commentators, and for which an unsatisfactory interpretation has been proposed, becomes quite intelligible on the hypothesis that an Assyrian dynasty was expelled from Southern and Western Babylonia by Nimrod, and founded Nineveh. All these points are important, but they are by no means sufficient to make us believe that the original Nimrod did not live centuries before the age of Kuthami, and that he was not one of the earliest conquerors and tyrants in the East. We observe that Chwolson, who adheres with the genuine tact of an honest and impartial inquirer, not upon religious, but upon critical and historical grounds, to the Scriptural records, rejects without hesitation the theory advanced upon the unsatisfactory evidence of cuneiform inscriptions, or rather of conjectural interpretations, that the Nimrod of Genesis was a Scythian by descent. As a general result of very careful consideration of his arguments, and of the facts supplied by ancient documents, our own conclusion is, that the name of Nimrod was really borne by the Canaanitish invader, and that he bore it as a title of honour derived from the most distinguished hero of his race.

The great antiquity which we have seen reason to believe must be assigned to the original work by Kuthami is sufficiently startling, and certainly will not be admitted without very searching criticism. We must, however, go much farther back if we receive the treatise at all. From statements too distinct to be explained away, and too intimately interwoven

¹ Chwolson says, from the Koran. This is a mistake. Nimrod is not named in that book, but appears at a very early period in the cycle of Arabian tradition, and in connexion with Abraham, and also specially with Babylon. A clear and correct account of the received opinions of Mahometans about Nimrod is to be found in Abulfeda's *Annales Anteislamitici*, ed. Fleischer, p. 20.

with the whole structure of the book to be rejected as mere interpolations, it must be inferred that the writers above mentioned as the predecessors of Kuthami lived some centuries before his age. In fact, if we may depend upon his authority at all, if we do not reject the whole series of statements as forgeries or mere dreams, we are to believe that in the third, or even the fourth millennium before Christ, powerful kings had reigned, religious systems had sprung up, been developed, and overthrown, that arts and sciences bearing upon practical details of life had been successfully cultivated, and a copious and intrinsically valuable literature had been produced. Chwolson sustains this bold position with remarkable ability. One historical combination rests upon a series certainly of undesigned and most unexpected coincidences. We submit it, together with a few additional circumstances gleaned from other sources, to the consideration of our readers. In a passage quoted from Dhagrith, who, according to Chwolson, must have lived between 1800 and 1900 years before our epoch, we read of a correspondence by letters between a Babylonian and an Egyptian king, named Sephuras; the letter must have been written a considerable time before Dhagrith's own time, and according to Chwolson's calculation, based upon internal evidence alone, about the year 3200 B.C. Chwolson wrote at once to the Chevalier Bunsen, giving him an account of his own investigations, and inquiring of him whether such a correspondence appeared from Egyptian monuments probable or possible. He received the answer that the name was unquestionably identical with that of the last king but one of the third dynasty of Manetho, that there could be no doubt as to the historical character of that dynasty, which immediately preceded one of the most illustrious in the annals of Egypt, that of the founders of the great pyramids, and that the date which he had previously fixed for the reign of Sephuris was 3250 B.C. Without at all making ourselves responsible for the accuracy of the calculations of either of these distinguished scholars, we must admit that the coincidence, if fortuitous, is one of the most remarkable in the records of historical criticism.

Scarcely less remarkable is the historical combination suggested by the subject-matter of that epistle. It was certainly a subject most utterly unlikely to have suggested itself to the mind of a literary impostor at any age; one which no Chaldean of a later epoch would have thought likely to reflect credit upon his ancestors, or to have excited any interest in his readers. It related simply to the introduction into Egypt of a particular kind of leek, which was cultivated in Babylon. We have seen that Sephuris belonged to the third Egyptian dynasty.

According to Bunsen, the group of pyramids at Abusir, somewhat more ancient than those of Gizeh, which, as all Egyptologists admit, were the work of the fourth dynasty, was built by the sovereigns of the third dynasty. Sepsuris was therefore one of the first princes who employed the labours of an immense population in raising those stupendous monuments of the skill, power, and selfish vanity of the Pharaohs. Now every reader of Herodotus is familiar with the fact, that the cost of the erection of the pyramids was estimated by the consumption of leeks—a statement which, as we are reminded by one of the most amusing instances of ingenious absurdity in modern speculators, is supported by monumental inscriptions, and agrees also very well with the Scriptural narrative, which records the kind of food so satisfactory to the Israelitish captives engaged in building operations under the Pharaohs. The pressure upon the resources of the country must have been enormous when its labour was taxed to erect those edifices, and no subject would be so important to a sovereign of that time as the introduction of a cheap and plentiful article of food. What more probable than that Sepsuris should have applied to the king of the most fertile and highly cultivated country in the world?

But was an Egyptian of that age likely to be able to carry on a written correspondence with any foreign nation, and especially with Babylonia? Here, again, we have some curious facts from Egyptian monuments. In the first place, Tosorthros, who belonged to the third dynasty, and reigned about one hundred years before Sepsuris, is said to have directed his attention especially to the improvement of the art of writing;¹ again if Sepsuris is to be identified, as Brugsch believes, with Snephrou, we have these further coincidences. That king is represented in the inscription on the rocks of the Wadi Maghara, in Arabia Petræa, as a conqueror in Asia; and the most ancient document of Egyptian literature, singularly interesting for the beauty of the composition, a papyrus MS. translated lately by M. Chabas, names this Snephrou as the reigning monarch at the date of the composition.

We have therefore these striking facts: a chronological coincidence based upon perfectly independent calculations; a

¹ Manetho, as quoted by Africanus and Eusebius ap. Syncellum, says, ἀλλὰ καὶ γραφῆς ἐπεμελήθη. Upon this M. Brugsch remarks: 'Il ne faut pas s'imaginer que Tosorthros ait inventé les lettres, car nous savons déjà que quelques années avant lui un de ses prédécesseurs avait composé sur l'anatomie des livres écrits. Tosorthros aura perfectionné le système de l'écriture égyptienne pour les divers usages de la vie.' *Histoire d'Egypte*, vol. i. p. 34. It is well known that representations of inkstands and reed pens are found on the great pyramids erected by the fourth dynasty. See also Bunsen's *Egypt*, vol. i. p. 306, B. T.

peculiar name found in contemporary documents of two remote and unconnected nations; a correspondence sufficiently justified, but on a subject most unlikely to have occurred to a forger; a proof that letters were then so far cultivated as to make such a correspondence easy; a special connexion of the Egyptian writer with Western Asia; and lastly, a period of active and energetic life, in both nations, immediately preceding a vast development of national wealth; the Babylonian king who succeeded was named 'the Golden,' while the dynasty which followed that of Sepsuris erected the greatest monuments in the world.

The arguments which cast a doubt upon the genuineness of this treatise, or suggest the inference that it may have been interpolated, will be considered more conveniently after a brief review of the other works translated by the same writers. These are of far less importance, yet they serve to complete the general impression, and contain many curious and interesting facts relating to the ancient civilization of Babylonia.

First comes a treatise with the formidable title, *THE BOOK OF POISONS*. In the inscription of this book, written by Abu Thalib Ez Zayat, it is expressly said that it was compiled according to the teaching of the Chaldees. Abu Beker himself tells us that he used the writings of several Chaldean physicians,¹ two of whom are often named in the preceding treatise of Kuthami. We find also, that he introduces many observations of a practical character, with the usual Arabian formula, 'Abu Beker,' or 'Ibn Wahshiyyah says.' Sometimes, however, he inserts passages without giving any such intimation, nor do we feel convinced that such insertions may not be far more numerous and important than Chwolson is disposed to admit. The book attracted a good deal of notice, and was well known to Arabian writers at a comparatively late date. Haggi Khalfa gives a brief but correct account of its contents in the fifth volume, p. 98, of his great bibliographical work.² The principal author was a certain Jarbuka, a physician, and, as it would seem, a man of learning and talent. He belonged to the liberal party, and though he permitted the use of incantations and talismans, it was evidently without much faith in their efficacy. In one case, he remarks that he had treated a patient *secundum artem*, and employed also a certain form of incantation.³ The patient was

¹ Herodotus tells us there were no physicians in Babylon. This appears in no way incompatible with the statements of our authors, which refer to a far earlier age, considering the great social and political revolutions which had occurred in the interim.

² *Lexicon Bibliographicum et Encyclopædicum*. One of the greatest and most important works published for the Oriental Translation Fund.

³ Chwolson gives the original formula, p. 123, without any explanation. It is evidently of Syriac or Chaldaic origin, but mutilated and corrupted by transcribers.

cured, whether, Jarbuka says, in consequence of the treatment or the incantation I know not; at any rate, the latter could do no harm. Such notices occur very frequently, and it is tolerably clear on the one hand that the belief in magic was so prevalent in his time that a physician's practice would be ruined, perhaps his life endangered, if he refused to employ such arts; and, on the other hand, that Jarbuka had neither the courage, nor the strong scientific conviction which would have impelled him to attack a popular superstition. The mixture of magic and really practical or even scientific attainments, cannot surprise any reader conversant with the history of the healing art. It is found in the works of the true fathers of medical science, of a Theophrastus, a Serapion, and a Galen. The same word, it is well known, is used in Greek for a medicine, a poison, and a magic filtre.

The most curious point in this book is, that it proves the habitual employment of poisons by the sovereigns in whose age it was written. Jarbuka feels the necessity of excusing himself for writing a work on so dangerous a subject, but asserts that his real object was to protect his fellow-men from the arts of poisoners. This is obviously a mere pretext. He gives receipts for poisons frequently without any antidote; and whether with the enthusiasm of a natural philosopher, or actuated by worse motives, his thoughts and even his dreams run upon this fearful, but intensely interesting subject. He lies, indeed, under the dark suspicion of devoting his talents and acquirements to the worst of purposes. He tells us himself that the Babylonian kings were regularly in the habit of using poison to rid themselves of troublesome neighbours, or of subjects who, by their rank, wealth, or position, excited their suspicion or envy. We read that, from the most ancient times, those princes paid large sums to persons who could supply them with strong poisons or effective antidotes, and that they preserved such medicaments among their costliest treasures. In the long list of poisons which Chwolson gives in his analysis of the treatise, it is curious to find that the strange delusions so prevalent in the sixteenth century at the courts of the Valois and of the Italian princes were anticipated. It was there believed that death could be inflicted by poison through the medium of all the senses. There are receipts for poisons which kill the unlucky wight who touches, smells, and even looks at them. Many of these are simply childish; some are medicaments which would only cause a slight or temporary derangement of the system.¹ Still, among the animal, vegetable, and mineral poisons, both

¹ The results, however, might often be fatal in that hot and marshy district.

simple and compound, which he enumerates, many are undoubtedly deadly, and combined with considerable ingenuity and scientific skill.

Chwolson observes, justly enough, that from this work it is clear the Borgias cannot claim the priority of the invention of removing enemies or rivals by poison. We are somewhat surprised that he did not notice a fact of far more importance in its bearing upon the Arabian translators. The practice of poisoning was frightfully common at the court of the magnificent and highly cultivated, but cruel and perfidious, Abbassides. The first act of Al Mansur, the founder of Bagdad, was to poison his brother's Vizier. Haroun Al Rashid removed many of his subjects and rivals by poison; and was strongly suspected of poisoning his brother. The Vizier of Mutadhid, who died two years before Abu Beker began the translation of these works, poisoned more than one man of rank. That prince, a patron of learning and genius, himself a poet, and the intimate friend of persons living in the same social circle with Abu Beker, and Ez Zayat, was poisoned by his secretary. Men in high and dangerous stations frequently carried about with them deadly and rapid poisons concealed in their signet-rings, to save themselves from the cruel tortures to which they were at any moment liable. The illustrious Abd el Melek Ez Zayat had perished under unendurable tortures, which lasted some eleven days, about fifty years before the book was published by his descendant.¹ These facts account sufficiently for the choice of such a subject by the translators. They may, perhaps, suggest a suspicion that the passages describing the practices of old Babylonians were, if not invented, yet pointed by Abu Beker and his friend; who must have felt a not unnatural satisfaction in thus covertly describing the crimes of their own hated and tyrannical masters.

Hitherto, as Chwolson observes, we have been occupied with works more or less of a scientific character; we have now before us a genuine Chaldean, one altogether resembling his

¹ These facts are recorded by all Mahometan annalists; the list may be greatly extended from Weil's '*Geschichte der Khalifen*,' b. 2. The following anecdote is related by Ibn Ethikthaka, in his curious and very interesting work, *al Fachri*, published this year by Ahlwardt, p. 184. 'When Al Mansur succeeded to the Chaliphate, he had a feeling of animosity against his Vizier, and gave him poison in some almond soup. When the Vizier felt it working, he rose to leave the room: Al Mansur asked where he was going, to which he answered quietly, "Where thou hast sent me, O commander of the Faithful!" A truly oriental scene. Scarcely any distinguished man, in those days, died suddenly without giving occasion to rumours of poisoning. Thus Al Mansur, who died after drinking the chilly river Cydnus, near Tarsus, a fatal stream to sovereigns, was believed to have been poisoned by his physician, at the instigation of his brother and successor.' — *Reiske on Abulfeda*. Ann. tom. ii. p. 686.

countrymen, who were found so frequently, and bore so bad a reputation in Rome, towards the end of the republic, and under the Cæsars. We have to do with one of those Chaldean astrologers, or calculators of nativities, whose principles and persons were condemned by the nobler spirits of Babylon, but who found more friends than enemies in the West during nearly 2,000 years.

He bore this name—Tenkelusha, the Babylonian of Kufa. This personage was not unknown previously, but the accounts of him found in Mahomedan writers are fabulous or contradictory. The time at which he lived is exceedingly doubtful. From internal evidence, Chwolson concludes that he must have been an inhabitant of Babylon under the dynasty of the Arsacidæ, not later than the early part of the first century of our era. He speaks of a native prince or king in Babylon, who was a tributary or vassal of the Persians. This could scarcely have been possible under the Achæmenidæ, but we read of several dependent kings in Mesopotamia at the time of the Arsacidæ. The writer speaks of Babylon as a rich city, with a mixed population, including many Greek residents, who had their own temples, and retained their national character for talents, attainments, and also for dishonesty and falsehood. For our part, we are rather disposed to believe that the Chaldean writer, who wrote the treatise, or compiled it in its actual form, lived at a far later time, and that he was acquainted with the Rabbinical legends, if not with the Koran. Still, he must have used ancient Chaldean documents; and many of the very curious accounts which he gives of social customs, institutions, and religious systems, belong, if not to the Babylon of Kuthami, yet to an age when that city was rich, luxurious, adorned with magnificent temples, and was still a centre of intellectual culture. From incidental notices we cannot doubt that, when the writer of the original documents lived, there must have been a rush and struggle—a wild and multitudinous din of life—a marvellous development of human energies, such as can scarcely have been surpassed in Bagdad itself, when Abu Beker and Ez Zayat published this extraordinary work. We read of artists of all kinds, jewellers, painters, sculptors, merchants of immense wealth, living like princes at home, carrying on commerce with the remotest lands, postmen, musicians, slaves of both sexes, ships laden with the wares of China, paper and porcelain. We have descriptions of men of generous and heroic character, of robbers and bandits, of devotees and hermits practising the most rigorous austerities, and anticipating the wildest extravagances of Eastern or Western monasticism. There are learned botanists, zoologists, philosophers speculating on the

why and wherefore, the origin and end of existence, physicians, veterinary surgeons, astronomers, historians, orators, preachers, poets, schoolmasters armed with the time-honoured ferule, and even then more remarkable for conceit than knowledge: we have lawyers, travellers undertaking long voyages for purposes of pleasure, profit, and even scientific research, antiquarians, students engaged in comparing the various mythological systems of the old world, professors of every branch of art, science, and literature. It is a strange, wild, but most animated and interesting series of pictures, introduced evidently not for the sake of effect, but in connexion with the calculation of nativities, and bearing directly upon the fortunes and pursuits of individuals born under various horoscopolical combinations. The work appears to have been exceedingly popular at Bagdad. The courtiers, many of whom, as we have seen, were more or less disaffected to the national faith, and inclined either to atheism or mystic superstitions, are said to have studied magic and astrology in the writings of Ibn Wahshiyya, whose name was transmitted to posterity with a doubtful reputation as a teacher of occult and forbidden arts. We are, however, convinced that the general colouring of the treatise must have been to a great extent the result of considerable interpolations at a time so near to that in which it was published by the translators, as to cast some shadow of doubt upon their judgment, if not upon their literary good faith.

The last work of which Chwolson gives an account is entitled 'The Book of the Secrets and Mysteries of the Sun and Moon.' It is, however, generally quoted by Arabian authors under the abbreviated titles, 'Book of the Mysteries of the Moon,' or simply, 'The Book of Mysteries.' Sometimes, with reference to its contents, it is called 'The Book of Disintegrations or Natural Transformations.'

It consists of extracts from two works, asserted to be of great antiquity. The first by Ascolebitha,¹ the founder, or first apostle of the worship of the sun in Babylon. His great object was to prove the theory, to which we have already alluded, that man may imitate the processes of nature, and artificially produce not only plants and metals, but even living beings. The other treatise is the same which is quoted occasionally by Kuthami, as 'the great work of Adami.' Without entering farther into the curious questions suggested by these speculations, we may observe that in their wildest dreams the Babylonians did not go farther than the Rosicrucians, the alchemists, or even some of the most distinguished naturalists of the last century. We are not aware that there is reason to suspect the translators of

¹ The name, of course, reminds us of *Æsculapius*.

taking up any popular theories of their own time: on the contrary, we have grounds for supposing that so far as the notions reappear in later writings, either in the East or West, they may be traced to a Chaldean origin. Whether they were really subjects which occupied the minds of the men who lived in what a Lyall might call the Eocene period of humanity, is a matter which will not be settled until the genuineness of these fragments, and the historical character of the statements which they contain, are corroborated by monumental inscriptions, such as may be looked for when the vast sepulchral cities of Southern Babylonia have yielded up their secrets to European energy and research.

We must not leave the arguments unnoticed which may be suggested against the authenticity of the whole, or of considerable portions of these treatises. Such an inquiry must, however, necessarily be incomplete until we have the entire documents before us: and we have the satisfaction of knowing that Chwolson is fully aware of the force of the objections, most of which he has discussed, promising a complete investigation in the historical introduction which he proposes shortly to publish.

We do not attach much weight to the objection that it is improbable that Kuthami, and still more so that Ibn Wahshiyyah should have been able to decipher or understand writings of so remote an epoch. The immobility of the whole family of Semitic languages has been long recognised as one of their most characteristic features. In no branch of those languages is this peculiarity more distinctly shown than in the dialects of Chaldea and Syria. M. Rénan, a very competent and unprejudiced judge, observes:—‘On trouverait peu d'exemples d'une homogénéité comparable à celle qui, depuis les temps antiques jusqu'à l'invasion musulmane, caractérise les langues parlées dans le pays compris entre le Tigre et la côte orientale de la Méditerranée.’¹

Chwolson tells us that he is acquainted with an uneducated Arabian, from the neighbourhood of Mekka, who finds no difficulty in understanding the most ancient Arabian poetry, and speaks the classical language of his ancestors—facts which are fully corroborated by the most intelligent travellers. There can be no doubt that if fragments of the very oldest Syriac were now discovered in legible inscriptions, the interpretation would present little difficulty to Orientalists.

Abu Beker, as we have already stated, was a learned man, a scholar and philologist, and thoroughly conversant with the then existing dialects of Babylonia: while both he and Kuthami occasionally observe that the original documents are obscure and

¹ *Histoire des Langues Sémitiques*, p. 270.

in part unintelligible. It may, moreover, be granted that in the course of ages obsolete words and phrases were probably modernised by the Chaldean transcribers, so that our translators may have had the genuine works, but not the precise words of the old Babylonians.

In any spurious or interpolated works it is all but impossible that anachronisms should not occur, and most improbable that they should escape the acute and jealous eye of modern criticism. We cannot say what may be the result of further inquiry, but at present there are few serious indications of such defects in the most important of these treatises. The most striking, and indeed, if not capable of explanation, a conclusive objection is that in two passages, Hermes and Agathodæmon are represented as interdicting the use of beans and fish to their countrymen. It occurs, of course, to every reader, that the prohibition itself is of Pythagorean or old Italic origin; Chwolson meets this part of the objection fairly, and, we think, satisfactorily. He proves that, quite independently of mystical or superstitious notions, abstinence from such food was commonly enjoined in very ancient times; and, what is more important, that in the passage where Kuthami or Dhagrith discusses this question, he argues solely on physiological grounds. He refers to the works of old physicians, and gives good or bad, but at any rate practical empirical reasons, not for the prohibition, but for a moderate and judicious use of these articles. The mention of Hermes and Agathodæmon, which, beyond all doubt, belong to the mythical system of the Neoplatonists, can only be accounted for by supposing the passages to be glosses or interpolations. This is Chwolson's opinion, and after repeatedly reading the context, which he gives in the Arabic, we adopt his conclusion. They seem to us very natural observations of the translator, if not of a Chaldean copyist, who would, of course, be struck by the coincidence between this old document and the most popular speculations of his own age. The principal works of the Neoplatonists were translated by distinguished Syrian scholars during the life-time of Abu Beker; the religious system of the so-called Sabeans, as expounded both in Syriac and Arabic, by the same writers, was well known to literary men at Bagdad; and our translator, who, as we have already shown, does not scruple to introduce observations of his own, would scarcely miss such an opportunity of comparing the wisdom of his own ancestors with that of their popular neighbours. We consider, indeed, that the fact that such theories and speculations are not interwoven with the whole substance and fabric of the treatise, is one of the strongest arguments in favour of its genuineness.

A more formidable objection, so formidable indeed that in

Ewald's opinion it is almost conclusive against the assumed antiquity of the whole book, is the mention of Greeks, under the name of Ionians. This occurs, indeed, only in one passage, which might also be rejected as an interpolation. Chwolson, however, as we think, judiciously, does not avail himself of this easy way of evading the difficulty. He enters into an inquiry, which we recommend to the consideration of antiquarians, what people are meant by Ionians, and under what circumstances, and at what age, they may first have come into contact with Babylonians. He refers to late investigations by Curtius, Classen, Movers, as proving that the Greek population in Asia Minor did not, as was formerly supposed, migrate thither in the twelfth century, but that under various names they were settled there from far more ancient times; and he shows that the name 'Ionians,' 'Javan,' or, as in these writings, 'Iununi,'¹ was of Oriental origin, and applied by old Eastern writers to the half-barbarian tribes of Arian descent in Asia Minor. Again, proceeding backwards from historic times, he shows that Greeks served in the armies of Nebuchadnezzar, among them Antemenedas, the brother of Alcæus; that Sennacherib invaded Asia Minor; and that there are indications in myths, traditions, and interchange of words, of communications between Mesopotamia and those lands in primeval times. In these treatises we read of invasions of Asia Minor by Babylonian kings, who, with the practical good sense of which we have so many proofs, procured specimens of rare trees and species of cereals from their tributaries. The passage in question is very curious; it describes the Ionians as a heavy, brutish, and uncivilized race, characteristics which certainly would not have been attributed to them at any historic age, although the writer admits that they had produced many distinguished men. We confess, however, upon the whole, that we do not consider that Chwolson has removed the difficulty, although he has certainly shaken our impression that the whole of these references, if not more thoroughly explained, or expunged as later interpolations, are unfavourable to the reception of the work in which they occur.

A still more suspicious circumstance is the undoubted resemblance, and the very probable identity, of many names among the ancient personages described in the treatise on Mæbalian agriculture, with those of the Scriptural narrative. We have an Adami, an Ishitha, Anuha, Ibrahim. Adami and Anuha are moreover engaged in works which suggest an acquaintance with Hebrew traditions. The first is one of

¹ It is a matter of doubt whether, as Lepsius and Chwolson suppose, the name Ionians occurs on Egyptian monuments of the thirteenth dynasty, i. e. long before Kuthami's time.

the earliest teachers of agriculture and founders of religion. In one passage of very grave import it is said that he gave names to all things. Anuha is connected with the cultivation of the vine. Ibrahim is called a Canaanite. Now it is true, that there is so glaring a discrepancy in other points, that we cannot suppose the writer to have derived his accounts of those persons directly from the Bible, and must therefore acquit the translators of a fraud, which, as they must have been well aware, would bring discredit upon the whole of these works. It is also a possible supposition that the names may have been altered or modified by Chaldean transcribers (in the long period which elapsed between the Israelitish captivity and the time of Abu Beker), either intentionally or unconsciously, so as to bear a stronger resemblance to those great names. Nor do we see why it should be doubted, that traditions of names and events connected with the history of the whole race should have floated down the stream of time, and have been amalgamated with the reminiscences of a people who lived near the times and the places with which they were associated. The name of Ishitha, in particular, suggests a bifurcated argument. It is evidently the same as Seth. Now it is well known, though Chwolson does not bring out the point, that the Sabeans, both those who originally bore, and those who, as Chwolson has shown, not long before the Arabian translator's age, assumed the name, represented Seth, the son of Adam, as the founder of their religious system, which resembled in its main features that attributed in these treatises to Ishitha. It might therefore be argued, either that we have a sufficient reason for identifying both legends, and rejecting them alike as myths, wholly without foundation in history; or the position may be maintained, that in this most ancient document we have the true account of the origin of systems which, in various forms, influenced the religious faith and mental development of the ancient world. We hope that Chwolson, of whose learning, ingenuity, and good faith, no doubt can be entertained, will discuss these important questions in his forthcoming work. These treatises will certainly not take a permanent place among the remains of ancient literature, until they have undergone a strict, searching, and jealous scrutiny. At present no man has the same opportunity as Chwolson. He occupies a vantage ground in his possession of the manuscripts, and in a knowledge of their contents, which years of patient study will alone enable any competitor to acquire. We trust that he will show in completing his labours, that the boldness, originality, and admirable tact which he has displayed in this, and in his former great work, are combined with that discretion and soundness of

judgment, without which the most vigorous intellect is liable to be deceived.

Our own general impression has been intimated in the course of this discussion. We are convinced that Abu Beker and his colleague actually translated these treatises from Chaldean documents, and that the additions, or interpolations, which they have introduced do not affect the general character of any, and especially of the most important of the works. We are also satisfied—and in this we follow the opinion of the greatest names in Eastern learning, Ewald, Quatremère, E. Rénan, Movers, Fleischer, Sprengel, and others less known to English readers—that the works contain remains of a primeval civilization, such as are found in no other writings, although they are in accordance with the indications of existing monuments of equal or even higher antiquity. We do not, however, feel that the question has yet been answered, how far those remains may have been mingled with later traditions, how far they may have been interpolated, or in some points radically corrupted by Chaldean transcribers, in the long interval before they came into the possession of the translators.

This question will occupy the minds of Oriental antiquarians; but whatever may be the result, we feel that we have but discharged our duty in thus bringing under the consideration of the general reader a subject of such profound interest, so important in its bearings upon the social, religious, and intellectual history of man.

ART. VII.—*Addresses to the Candidates for Ordination, on the Questions in the Ordination Service.* By SAMUEL, LORD BISHOP OF OXFORD. Oxford and London: J. H. & Jas. Parker. 1860.

It is a happy circumstance for the Church, in any age and country, when she has those among her chief pastors to whom she instinctively turns for the voice of counsel and guidance in her several emergencies. And such, to some extent, is the case with the English Church at the present day. When a sophism has to be shattered, and the truth, in the severe majesty of her proper lineaments, to be evoked from the mighty past to confound the petty argumentations of the present hour; when the denial of fundamental verities, or the legalizing of iniquity in high places, has to be sharply rebuked, and the promoters placed in a position (to say the least) of unpleasant notoriety; in all such matters we look, and not in vain, to hear from the lion-hearted prelate 'throned by the west,' the Bishop of Exeter. And no less naturally, when there is any question of deepening, raising, purifying the clerical standard and tone among us, do we listen for every word that may fall from the gifted lips of the great occupant of the see of Oxford. Many and varied as have been his labours, we feel that this is his *ἐργον*; that here he is peculiarly at home; that he is rendering fruits of a life's study and experience.

It is not for us, then, to commend the Bishop of Oxford, writing on the subject of clerical tone and clerical obligation. As we may not rebuke an elder, so were it no less presumptuous in us to commend one. Nor would any words of ours add warmth to the welcome which a treatise on such a topic from such a hand will already have received from the entire Church, though more especially, of course, from the Clergy. Our task, in reference to the volume named at the head of this paper, will rather be, first, simply to place on record, in our office of 'Christian Remembrancer,' the bestowal of so acceptable a boon on the Church, by the publication of these Addresses beyond the narrow circle of those who were fortunate enough to hear them orally delivered; and, secondly, to indicate the exact place which they fill, and we are assured will fill permanently, in the ecclesiastical literature of this country. The consideration of this will lead us to advert to some particulars connected with clerical training, and work lying outside the scope of this treatise. A misapprehension as to this point—we mean as to the exact design and scope of these Addresses—

may lead to disappointment ; while on the other hand, we are sure that, in the peculiar line which they take up, they will leave nothing to be desired.

As to the former point, our duty is discharged by the mere mention of the work. As to the latter, we desire to draw the reader's attention to the nature of the volume as defined by its title-page. It is not, then, a work on Ordination at large, but on 'The Questions in the Ordination Service.' Neither is it addressed, though it will not fail to find its way, to the entire body of the Clergy ; but to the candidates for Ordination, according to the form and order now provided in the Church of England, supposed to be assembled before the Bishop in that character. And it is true to its text. The Bishop of Oxford has made no attempt to say here everything that could be said concerning Ordination, or concerning the clerical position and work ; to sketch, for example, in all its vast outlines, the mighty whole of which an ordained ministry is but a part ; to enlarge on that lofty theme which fills the Epistle to the Hebrews ; to bring out, in all its vivid reality, that great action and *λειτουργία* which reaches from heaven to earth, having Christ for its high-priest and perpetual sacrifice, and the Church, with her oblation of herself—whether triumphant, at rest, or militant—for its 'complement,' or filling up. To do this, though none could have brought greater powers to the execution of it, has been no part of the author's purpose here. Neither, again, have the details of sacramental or other administration, either in their outward aspect or their deep-lying significance, engaged his attention. These and other topics might, doubtless, have been made to branch out from his subject ; nor is it possible to overrate their importance. A true and large theory as to the function and position of the Church *must* lie at the basis of all effective discharge of duty. Nothing short of such a theory, view, or call it what you will, is *sustaining* in the long run. Action, however energetic, which does not tell upon a purpose rightly conceived in its whole extent, is only so much action dissipated, if not wasted. This is a fact of which no one can suppose so great a psychologist as the Bishop of Oxford to be ignorant. Yet he has forborne in this volume to draw out any such comprehensive theory. So again, the whole theory of the sacraments, and indeed of all lower and ancillary ministration, should unquestionably be duly mastered by candidates for Ordination ; and there is that in our Ordinal which would suggest and justify the largest and fullest handling of these subjects in any *general* hortatory address to them. Yet neither on these does the Bishop of Oxford expatiate. And we wish to point out how true he is herein to the

distinctive character and genius of our Ordination Service, such as we possess it now.

As the point is of some importance, and involves incidentally matters of no slight interest, we shall make no apology for dwelling for awhile upon it. Among the things about which the English Church, in the sixteenth century, boldly, though not without due deliberation, took her own line, throwing herself (in the main) upon primitive usage for the outward form, and upon the imperious necessities of the case for the markedly *practical* tone and spirit adopted by her, the Ordination Office is undoubtedly to be reckoned. Those who have carefully examined the subject are aware that, amid the beautiful significances of the ancient Ordinals of this country, and of the West generally; amid the vesting with stole, and dalmatic, and chasuble, the solemn kiss, the publicly performed mixing of oil with the chrism, and the application of it to the fingers of the ordained (after the example of Aaron), 'from the top of the right thumb to the bottom of the left forefinger, and again from the top of the left thumb to the bottom of the right forefinger' (the hands of the ordained being spread out for the purpose); to which must be added, not least, the delivery of the gospels to the deacons, and of sacred vessels, and offered (not unconsecrated) elements into the hands of the priests;—that amid all this, and in some degree in consequence of it, there had crept over the Ordinal of the West, at least from the eleventh century, a painful and a *confessed* obscurity, and haziness, and doubt, as to *wherein the Ordination itself lay*. Morinus, in his great work, *De Sacris Ordinationibus*, recognises four leading opinions upon this point, and it would be easy to add largely to their number. Nor is this to be wondered at. The multiplications of ceremonies, accompanied each one by its appropriate prayer, has a tendency to depress the original and essential features of such an ordinance, by seeming to assign a co-equal importance to the new features, in virtue of the equal, or it may be even larger, *space* allotted to them. And if it has further come to pass, that the original and essential features, through any accidental circumstance, have positively as well as comparatively suffered diminution or obscuration, the effect is apt to be disastrous indeed. Now thus, while the Eastern Ordinals retained in the main their original pellucid clearness—thus, we say, had it fared with the Ordinal of the West for some centuries previous to the revision of it in this country. The essence of the rite, the *formalis causa*, the theory which should make it what it was designed to be, namely, an Ordination, had become so overlaid, obscured, and dislocated, that the features of an Ordination after the Apostolic model

were with difficulty to be discerned in it. For what is that essential thing? Undoubtedly, as we shall show presently, and as Holy Scripture itself unanswerably testifies, *the laying on of hands with prayer.*

Not in any one of those things to which the ingenuity or the necessities of the Schoolmen led them to discern the essence of Ordination—not in the anointing, which was unknown to the early Western Church, and is unknown to the Eastern to this day—not in the vesting, however solemn, however universal, however significant (the stole and the chasuble, alike in East and West, having possessed from very early times a deep ministerial symbolism)—not in the giving of the gospels to the deacon—not in the delivery of the sacred vessels with the elements to the candidate for the priesthood, or in the holding of the gospels over the head of the bishop—nor, yet again, in the combination of any of these with the laying on of hands—nor in the words wherewith the delivery of the vessels was accompanied—nor in the particular words, ‘Receive ye the Holy Ghost’—not in any of them, it has been fully proved by the learned Roman controversialist already mentioned, had the universal Church ever deemed the *formalis causa*, or *forma* of Ordination to lie. But was Morinus right, either, in placing it, as he seems to do, in the laying on of hands *alone*? Surely not. It is contrary to the whole analogy of sacramentalism to assign to an action, apart from words, a sacramental effect. The simple law enunciated by S. Augustine holds universally—*Accedit elemento verbum, et fit sacramentum.* Nor would Morinus, probably, have failed to complete his definition by adding ‘prayer’ to ‘the laying on of hands,’ and thus, had he not been swayed, unconsciously or not, by the fact that the Western Ordinal, even in the very ancient forms of it, directs, or *seems to direct*, that the imposition of hands be performed *in silence.* ‘Benedicente eos’ ‘Episcopo, et manum super capita eorum tenente, et *nihil eis dicente,*’ is the rubric in Ordination of priests. This rubric *seems*, we say, to forbid the ordaining Bishop to say *anything* while holding his hand upon the head of the candidate. It does not, however, necessarily mean this, nor is it very conceivable that it should have been so intended. How can the Bishop be said ‘benedicere’ at all if he ‘says nothing’? Either, therefore, we must understand the prohibition to be directed against saying anything to the candidate, as compared with saying a blessing over him; or, if it means more than this, we must give up the ‘*nihil eis dicente*’ altogether, as the unfortunate, however reverentially-intended, addition of a later age than the primitive. And this seems to be the most probable view. A very similar restraining clause occurs in the corresponding part of

the office for the Ordination of deacons—'Quibus inclinanti-
bus, solus Episcopus qui eos benedicit, manum super capita
'singulorum ponat, dicens, solus *secretè*, "Accipe Spiritum
'Sanctum."' Here, no less than in the former case, the *spoken*
word is suppressed. Such, then, was the structure of the
Western Ordinal, in the sixteenth century, alike in the Sarum
and in the Roman use, and such it continues in the latter to
this day. Our ancient Saxon Pontifical, Egbert's, of York,
belonging to the tenth century, has however no such provision,
nor had the Winchester even received it.)

Now we are not throwing any doubt upon the validity of the
Ordinations conducted for so many hundreds of years by Ordinals
thus constituted. The custom has for ages been, that the 'lay-
ing on' being performed in silence, the hands of the Bishop
are held suspended over all the candidates while prayers are
said over them. This is, of *a sort*, laying on of hands with
prayer, and as such may well be deemed valid. But *validity* is
one thing, regularity is another. And this is a grave blot,
howsoever it arose, a lamentable weakness, however it crept in,
in any office for Ordination. The whole East, as we shall see
presently, declaims with one voice against such silent imposition.
The ancient Western Communions give no countenance whatso-
ever to it. Nay, the Western Ordinal itself, taken in its entire
extent, admits the impeachment which the Church universal
brings against this unhappy rubric of reticence. For, in the
Order for the Consecration of a Bishop, no such reticence is
anywhere recognised. The rubric runs, 'Ordinatore super eum
'fundente benedictionem, reliqui Episcopi qui adsunt manibus
'suis caput ejus tangant, *et dicat* ordinator, Veni, Creator,' &c.
(Sarum Pontifical, Maskell, Mon. Rit. iii. p. 257.) The various
Pontificals, both early and late, Egbert's, the Roman, the Exeter,
the Winchester, however much they may differ as to the words
they prescribe or intend, give not the faintest prohibition against
the use of some words, and these uttered aloud, in consecrating
a Bishop. If then the consecration of a Bishop (which, what-
ever else it confers, can add nothing to the plenitude of the
priest's power in reference to the two sacraments, and so confers
less useful gifts), if this is to be accompanied by prayer at the
very time of laying on of hands, can it be a matter of indiffe-
rence whether the Ordination of a priest be similarly accom-
panied or not? And it was probably from a sense of this, in
the course of the twelfth century, that a *second* laying on of
hands, accompanied by 'Accipe Spiritum Sanctum,' was, as is
well known, introduced towards the close of the rite; and in
this, it is notorious that the Council of Trent, as expounded by
Bellarmine, places the essence of the Ordination.

But this, as it was confessedly a *late* expedient, comparatively speaking, for removing the ambiguity or unsatisfactory appearance of the rite, so was it a very ineffectual one. It was to little purpose that, long after the great solemnities of the rite, including Eucharistic consecration and reception, were to all appearance over, a little supplementary clause, having all the air of an after-thought, should at length introduce the familiar form and features of a real Apostolic Ordination—the laying on of hands *with prayer*, or words equivalent to prayer.

Such, at least, was manifestly the feeling of our tenth-century revisers. Their predecessors in the work of revision, some four centuries before had left the Ordinal, after all, a tangled wilderness—‘confusion worse confounded,’ indeed. The question wherein Ordination lay was, we have seen, a perfectly open, ‘most variously ruled’ question. In the most solemn hour of his life, the candidate for the awful office of a priest in the Church of God was left perfectly uncertain, and without guidance, as to *what* was the mighty deposit he was to receive—*wherein* the secret of his strength for his work—whether in the receiving of chrism, or vestment, or vessels, or books, or (the very comparison and doubt is painful to institute) in the laying on of hands, and the gift of the Holy Ghost. All this uncertainty, it was wisely determined, must at all hazards be removed. These two ancient, Apostolic, divinely-written postulates for Ordination must be rehabilitated at any cost. The supremacy and all-comprehensiveness of the awful gift must be effectually vindicated. Its proper connexion and conjunction with ‘laying on of hands’ must be brought out with perfect clearness and sharpness. Whatever the exact words (a matter of secondary importance, and one which had varied in all ages)—*words* of invocation and of commission at the very time of laying on of hands there must be. And, by a conciliation justly commended by a great ritualist now lost to us, it was decided (Maskell, t. iii. p. 221) to retain for the purpose the more recently introduced formula, ‘Receive the Holy Ghost,’ with such additions as should leave not a shadow of doubt as to the actual collation then and there, at no other time, and no otherwise, of *all* the gifts of the Christian ministry: ‘*Receive the Holy Ghost for the office and work of a Priest in the Church of God, now committed unto thee by the imposition of our hands. Whose sins thou dost forgive, they are forgiven, and whose sins thou dost retain, they are retained.* And be thou ‘a faithful Dispenser of the *Word of God*, and of His holy *Sacraments*; in the Name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost.’ The words which we have italicised in this well-known formula indicate the design of our

revisers to gather into the *impositionary* words all that can be conceived as pertaining to the ministry; as being contained and conveyed in the one gift of the Holy Ghost imparted by the laying on of hands. By this means were dispelled, once and for ever, the various imaginations and sophistries which had grown up about the rite—as the idea that sacramental power was conveyed by this ceremony (as the delivery of vessels and elements), &c.; prophetic gift by that (as the giving of a Bible); and the power of absolution by a third (namely, by the formula, ‘Receive ye,’ &c.—‘whose sins soever,’ &c.)—together with *that*, we say, all that had of late been imagined to be imparted parcelwise, and, if we may use the words, ‘at sundry times and in divers manners.’ Rightly was it taught now that the one gift includes all; and rightly was the vestment of that gift linked, as of old, to the actual time and action of laying on of hands. And it is worthy of remark, that more than one foreign Ordinal had preceded ours in the selfsame path of revision and recovery of the ancient idea and habit. Thus Martene notices that the comparatively modern Ordinal of Mayence prescribes that the ordaining Bishop should begin, and the Clergy take up, the anthem, ‘Accipe Spiritum Sanctum;’ and that then he should *lay both his hands on the head of each priest, and say*, ‘The Holy Spirit ‘come upon thee, and the power of the Highest keep thee from ‘sin.’ While those of Senlis and Angers—also late MSS. (Martene, tom. ii. p. 22)—prescribe the ‘Accipe Spiritum Sanctum,’ to accompany the laying on of hands. And that, as a local practice, this had existed as early as the tenth century, is proved by a passage in the life of Lietbert, Bishop of Cambray; in which it is said that, at his Ordination as priest, the words, ‘Receive ye the Holy Ghost,’ ‘whose sins soever,’ &c. were pronounced over him; and it must be borne in mind, that though the MSS. perused by Martene were of late date, they may represent a local use of considerable antiquity.

But it was not thought enough, at our sixteenth-century revision, thus to gather into one intense all-including invocation, and one rightly constituted formula of Ordination, the whole gift and work of the ministry, exactly as the Eastern Church (see note appended to this article) has done from the earliest times. In prudence, the too numerous and engrossing ceremonies, which had resulted in the stifling of the life of the office, must, it was deemed, be retrenched. The chrism, the vesting, the delivering of the sacred vessels, the kiss, and other minor details, accordingly disappear. That this was not from mere puritanism, or undervaluing of the impressiveness of such ceremonies, may appear from hence, that in the Order for the Con-

secration of Bishops (which, as we have seen, had not suffered obscuration in the same degree) *the gradual vesting was retained*. From the Ordinal for Priests a weighty incubus of misconception had to be rolled away, and it was done accordingly, with a fearless and vigorous hand.

And next, still further to bring out this true and Apostolic conception of an Ordination Office, there were certain appliances which might be fetched out of the Church's old storehouse. There were certain 'Admonitiones' or exhortations to candidates for every degree of the ministry, up to the priesthood, almost peculiar to the English Church, though found also elsewhere, as *e.g.* in the Rouen Pontifical (Martene, tom. ii. p. 17). These were not embodied, however, in our old Ordinal, but placed at the beginning of the entire Pontifical—a volume containing all Offices proper to Bishops: nor is it certain what use, if any, was made of them at Ordinations; most probably, however, it was during the period of preparation, and not at the Ordination itself. The admonition to the priests was now brought up into a conspicuous position in the forefront of the actual Ordination. It received, at the same time, a strongly practical turn. In its old form it was a *résumé*, admirably worked out, and based upon Holy Scripture, of the functions and position of the priesthood, in relation to the priestly office of Christ, and other like matters. All this was remanded to the sermon, now become an unfailing feature in the rite, and to the other previous preparation of the candidates. In truth, the exhortation, in its new form, was rather the carrying out of a direction appended to the older form: 'Quibus omnibus de sacerdotali officio breviter pertractatis, *admonendi sunt sacerdotes*, quatenus, sicut excellunt ordinis dignitate, sic excellent vite sanctitate; ut *plebs eis commissa* atque eorum disciplinis edocta, gratanter eis obediat, et eorum imitatione de die in diem proficiat, et ad *præmia perveniat sempiterna*.' (Maskell, Mon. Rit. ii. 236.) The reader will recognise here the familiar words of our present admonition to the candidates for the priesthood. 'You have heard, brethren, as well in your private examination as in the exhortation which has now been made to you' (*viz.* in the sermon) 'of *what dignity*, and of how great importance *this office is*.' And again, he will be reminded of, 'Will you apply your diligence to frame your *lives* . . . and to make yourselves . . . wholesome *examples* to the flock of Christ?' 'that they may be saved through Christ for ever.'

It may be further remarked, that whereas the old Sarum Admonitio ran entirely in the third person, and was a description of the priestly office rather than an exhortation to the due discharge of it, the new form is in the second person throughout,

and carries all the weight of a personal and personally applied appeal. The Rouen specimens, however, of similar admonitions, preserved by Martene, commence, in the case of the minor orders, in the second person, as follows: 'Mysterium ordinis quem appetitis vobis aperire debemus:' 'Nomen vestri ordinis quem exposcitis, quid in se continet noscere debetis:' 'Illi, fratres, qui hoc officio quod appetitis utuntur, subdiaconi vocantur.' And, what is yet more to our purpose, the old Sarum Ordinal itself concluded with a direct admonition in the second person: '*Quia res quam tractaturi estis satis periculosa est, fratres carissimi, moneo,*' &c. The subject of it was, however—and a very necessary one in any age, though more so when the ritual was so complex and so minutely regulated—the duty of thoroughly mastering the due mode of celebration and administration of the Holy Communion. 'Ut diligenter et honestè totius missæ ordinem, et consecrationem, et fractionem, atque communicationem ab aliis jam doctis sacerdotibus discatis, priusquam missam cantare præsumatis.' But this brief admonition is the manifest original, as to form, of one sentence in our present exhortation: 'Forasmuch, then, as your office is both of so great excellency, and of so great difficulty,' &c.

The reference just made to the '*Questions to the Candidates for Holy Orders*' brings us to one other and completing touch, which, perhaps, above all others, stamps the revised Ordinal with a deeply practical and subjective tone and character, and which, accordingly, has furnished the text of the Bishop of Oxford's Addresses. In the old Ordinal there were no such questions addressed to *priests* at all; if we except the single inquiry about obedience to the Ordinary, now placed at the end of the Western Ordinal. But to Bishops such specific questions had been addressed before consecration ever since the eleventh century. Originating in England or France, they were subsequently adopted into the Roman Ordinal. But, in truth, such inquiries had, in some form or other, from the earliest times, pursuant to the injunctions of S. Paul to Timothy, been solemnly put to the Bishop-elect. The fourth council of Carthage (A.D. 398) prescribes the tenor of them: 'Whether he be prudent, apt to teach, temperate, pure, sober, attentive to his affairs, humble, affable, charitable, well learned, instructed in God's law, wary in expounding Holy Scripture, well versed in the decrees of the Church, and, above all, sound in the Catholic faith.' Later councils, as the eleventh of Toledo, A.D. 675, extend the practice to the other orders—as, indeed, it is probable that the Carthaginian rule for Bishops was intended to apply to them also. 'Placuit, ut unusquisque, qui ad ecclesias-ticos gradus est accessurus, non ante honoris consecrationem'

(this term was anciently applied to all orders from the diaconate upwards) 'accipiat, quam promittat ut fidem catholicam 'sincerâ cordis devotione custodiens, *justè et piè vivere debeat.*'

So just was the instinct by which our present *Questions*, modelled for the most part on those addressed, as of old, to Bishops, were introduced into the Order for making and ordaining priests and deacons; and so true, moreover, are they, in respect of their profoundly practical turn, to the mind of earlier days.

Such then, was the revolution, for we can call it no less, as to expression and tone, effected in our Ordinal in the sixteenth century. From a service, rich, varied, multiform, a service of much ceremonial and many significant actions, and didactic thereby on many parts of ministerial duty, but dubious, through its very richness and multiplicity of salient features, as to its exact aim and point; it became a service plain, simple, and didactic—but of which no one could for a moment mistake the single aim and the proper theory—so solitary, and we must add imposing in its proportions, stood forth to view the one all-comprehending idea, to which, it was conceived, all others ought to be sacrificed rather than it should be in the least degree lost sight of or undervalued.

In point of earnestness and the beauty of the particular prayers, the new and the old Ordinal are much on a par. It is in the singleness with which the gift of the Holy Ghost by the imposition of hands is set forth as the essence of the rite, and in the fervent personal appeal effected by the exhortations and questions, that the characteristics of the revised form are to be found.

How far this transformation or revolution was really necessary, we pretend not to decide. That there was a strong case for it has, we think, been shown. We confess to regretting very deeply the loss of the old significant ceremonies. But the reader will be in a better position to form a judgment on this point, and on the whole range of very interesting questions belonging to the subject, if we refer to the Eastern provisions, especially the earliest known to us, in the matter of Ordination; of which we have accordingly drawn out a brief statement at the end of this article. We would invite attention to two points in particular, tending to countersign and confirm the line taken by our revisers; the one, the unequivocal distinctness with which the Eastern Ordinal places the essence of Ordination where our revised rite places it, and gathers all gifts together with the prayer of imposition; the other, (a doctrine very necessary for these times,) the real bestowal there recognised of the Holy Ghost, by the laying on of hands with prayer. In other

words, we make our appeal to Eastern antiquity in vindication both of 'the outward visible sign or form,' to which, as against the mediæval doctors, we attribute Ordination; and of 'the inward spiritual grace,' which, as against the gainsayers of the day, we believe to be imparted. These are the main points; on minor details we may derive from this source corroboration or correction.

It was a necessary result of the change which we have now traced in the English Ordinal, to impart to the reception of Holy Orders an intense sense of mission, of gift, of responsibility. The manifold purposes and graces which had now been gathered up into the one formula of imposition, and were instinctively attributed to the comfort, gift, and indwelling of the Holy Ghost, naturally prompted burning words of exhortation, and close questionings and testings of that inward will by which those powers were henceforth to be wielded and exercised. The Office had become, in modern phrase, intensely subjective. And no one can read the Addresses now before us without feeling that the Bishop of Oxford has thoroughly penetrated and faithfully enforced this distinctive spirit of our Ordinal: and has developed, with all that extraordinary force and felicity which belongs to his written or spoken teaching, this side of the subject.

In his hands, the *Questions* become weapons of power indeed, penetrating thin veils, tearing off disguises, scrutinizing the entire being and will. They are made to turn their searching light in every nook and corner of ministerial and parochial action. No one who reads them can plead any ignorance of the vast demands made by the ministry of the Church of God on the energies, the self-denial, the wisdom, the patience, the love, the humility, of those to whom it is committed. Indeed, one remark which will frequently occur to the reader, experienced or otherwise, to the former more especially, is that these are in reality instructions for the ripe and tried parochial priest; so much is there the truth of which he alone can bear testimony to. They cannot be thoroughly appreciated by those to whom they are properly addressed. The book is a book to be laid up for frequent reference, especially in Ember weeks, and other solemn times.

The first Address, on 'The Inward Call,' and the ninth, on 'Diligence in the Study of the Holy Scriptures,' are perhaps the most striking specimens of the power, both literary and theological, which pervades the whole series. Take, from the first Address, the following climax and anti-climax, combined with a practical exhibition, at a single touch, of the moral meaning of 'Antichrist:—

'As the rule, the ministry continues in its leading character as it commences. There is, of course, a growth in every living ministry; a growth from the weak uncertainty of infancy to the confirmed strength of perfect manhood; a growth in knowledge, comprehension, power, skill, insight, faith, and love; but whilst there is growth on all sides in a living ministry, growth is not in the dead. The increase of corruption is there the only change. This is, indeed, the enemy's sad mockery of growth; the development, within each false ambassador of Christ, of the character of Antichrist; the full ripening and perfecting of selfishness, in one of its various forms of covetousness, or lust, or worldliness, or utter sloth and carelessness; the contracting and the hardening of the soul; the dulling of all conscience, till it sleeps to awake only in the terrible form of the worm which dieth not.'—P. 5.

Or the following, on the true point of self-inquiry:—

'It will be especially needful for us to remember, that it is not of *feelings* one way or the other that the great question should be asked; it reaches far deeper into the centre of our being; and these lighter airs of feeling may be nimble as the gales of summer, or charged thick with clouds and sadness, when the central man is of a mind wholly other from their mutable and deceitful aspect.'—P. 9.

As to sermons:—

'Be real with them; strike as one that would make a dint upon their shield of hardness, yea, and smite through it to their heart of hearts. When you preach, be real. Set your people before you in their numbers, their wants, their dangers, their capacities; choose a subject, not to shew yourself off, but to benefit them; and then speak straight to them, as you would beg your life, or counsel your son, or call your dearest friend from a burning house, in plain, strong, earnest words. And, that you may be thus real, I would counsel you from the first to take as little of your sermons as possible from those of other men. Let them be your own, made up of truths learned on your knees, from your Bible, in self-examination, and amongst your people. And, to make your sermons such as this, spare no pains or trouble. Beware of giving to God and souls the parings of your time, and the ends of other employment. Beware of a pernicious facility. However poor or ignorant your people are, you may be assured that they will feel the difference between sermons which have been well digested and well arranged, and those which are put carelessly and ill together. Think your subject thoroughly over; settle, if possible, on Sunday evening, next Sunday's subject. Meditate on it as you walk about your parish; pray for power to enforce it; and as you read God's Word, and go about your parish, light will break out on it, illustrations occur, applications suggest themselves; and when you write or speak, you will be full and orderly, and this is to be strong.'—Pp. 13, 14.

The temptations of the merely studious and contemplative life, as in the case of those ordained on a college title:—

'They who have retired from the busy world to contemplation and a cell, have found ere now, too often, that the Satan whom they fled from in the crowd has travelled on before them to meet them in the waste. Self-confidence, fondness for speculation, love of singularity, separation from their brethren, and then the misty visions of the darkening eye, the eager throbbings of the narrowing heart, heresy, schism, unbelief, and apostasy,—these are the special dangers of the unwatchful Christian student. How deeply, but as yesterday, some have thus fallen

even by our side, is known to all of us. They are set as beacons to us, if such is our path, that we "be not high-minded, but fear;" lest like them we too be led hereafter deliberately to adopt errors which we have been permitted erewhile to expose with a clearness withheld from others; and, at last, to fly on the wings of an unbounded scepticism into the bosom of an unfathomed superstition.—Pp. 15, 16.

The second Address, entitled 'The Glory of God,' will recall the paper on 'Second Motive,' in Mr. Monro's 'Parochial Work.' The two treatises, indeed, have much in common; at least the strongly subjective learning discernible in both of them. If we were to hazard comparison between them, we should say that the work of the presbyter is tinged with a certain morbidness and touch of extravaganza, in its conception of the personal work of the ministry, from which the Addresses of the Bishop are wholly free.

The entire Address evokes from the old Scriptures a draught and conception of what it is to be a 'deceived prophet,' such as it is impossible to read but with deep emotion, and at the same time with a high admiration for the exegetical and artistic power manifested in the delineation. Though, indeed, the entire Address is truly great on the subject of divine afflictions, and 'the gift of the Holy Ghost.' It is here, and in similar passages, that we trace the operations of that distinctive form and spirit of our Ordinal, on which we have so much enlarged. The Address is a genuine efflux of the ritual. The following extract is long, but it will not bear abridging:—

'Now the deepest and truest answer to all such questions' (respecting the recreations, or mode of spending time, of the clergy), 'and they are very many, and very practical, and some of them, when looked at only in themselves, not a little puzzling,—lies, I think, in the truth with which we are now dealing. For what constitutes in its highest essence the office of Christ's minister? No less than this, that it *does really wield the powers of the world to come*; that it is truly and indeed a spiritual office, not only because it is concerned about spiritual things, but because, if it is to be discharged aright, the powers of the blessed Spirit of God must accompany the outward acts which Christ's minister performs in the name of Christ. Let the unbelieving world scoff as it may, it still remains true that these powers are in the Church of Christ. The Holy Ghost abides with her. By Christ's own word His presence was promised to the end, and His word is sure. That promise, then, does continue. The Comforter is present with us, as He is not with the world. And what is it that God must intend to convey to us by the promise of a special Presence? Surely it is that He condescends to our infirmities, and employs our language. And with us bodily presence and the power of performing any works are so identical, that we naturally associate the two together: so, when God means to raise our expectations of the certainty of His working His work within us, He, Who by the necessity of His divine nature is always present everywhere, speaks of Himself as being specially present with us in the offices of His Church. And how then does God work in the Church of Christ? Surely by Sacraments and means of grace: by a living

ministry, in the performance of its special functions: by acting through His ministers upon the souls and spirits of those to whom they minister; by acting through them as His instruments, sometimes merely officially, so that what they do according to His will, He does,—as when they minister the Sacraments, or declare His absolution to the penitent; to the validity of which official acts, manifestly, the holiness or unholiness of the minister can add no weight, and interpose no bar; because in them His ministers are but the simple instruments for doing acts, to the doing of which acts He has appended His blessing for every faithful recipient of them. But this extends not to all their acts. For he uses His servants not merely as simple instruments for doing certain actions, but He employs also the powers of their minds and souls to affect the minds and souls of their brethren. This it is which makes them dispensers of His Word. His Word is to be applied, enforced, explained, brought home to souls, by the intellectual and spiritual powers of His ministers, and through these powers of theirs He acts; so that their spiritual office reaches to this; it secures for its due holder, when duly exercised, the co-operation of the Holy Spirit with him in his work; and hence, of course, is all its efficiency and strength. For how could man's mind or spirit, without this marvellous gift, act upon the mind and spirit of another so as to quicken it towards God and leaven it with holiness? But there is this power in man's ministrations, because it is God's plan to work thus through men on others. So, manifestly, it has been ever since the Church of Christ was founded. . . . And that which we see thus most plainly in these, who were direct recipients of inspiration, and who were therefore the types of all inspiration, this is indeed repeated in its measure in every true minister of Jesus Christ; he, too, by his ordination, is made "a fellow-worker with God;" he, too, who by his baptism was brought for himself as a living soul into the midst of the mighty powers of the world to come, whereof we speak; he now, of God's great goodness *in his ordination* is made a channel whereby these spiritual blessings are to be conveyed to others. He is to be a stirrer up of other souls; the breath of God's awakening, convincing, converting, enlightening, purifying Spirit is now to breathe through him; the Spirit is to speak through him; though he has not, and needs not, any new revelation so far as concerns the great subject-matter of his doctrine, though that has from the first been written down for him in God's Word, and since defined and explained in creeds and articles, and held in, and, as need has been, drawn forth afresh from, the living spiritual consciousness of Christ's Church, yet from him it is to be reproduced as a new thing for others: the Holy Ghost will overshadow his spirit; and his spiritual life in its conflicts, hopes, fears and joys is to pour itself forth for others in appeal, doctrine, warning, comfort, and instruction.'—Pp. 174—177.

The remedies which are suggested throughout for the difficulties of the ministry are abundantly simple: love, prayer, a holy life, singleness of purpose, reality, tender handling, sense of the value of souls, and the like. These are continually brought forth, with a never-failing variety and charm of expression. And we shall venture to cull here and there a few of the pointed and polished utterances which abound throughout the volume, and which will live on the ear and the memory of all who have once read them.

The province of theology towards man is thus defined:—

'We shall explain to men the enigma of their own nature by casting on it the light of God's countenance.'—P. 44.

'As an evil life breeds heresies by a spontaneous generation in the human soul, so does a vigorous life of holiness destroy those parasitical corruptions which attach themselves to bodies of a weaker vitality.'—Pp. 72, 73.

About sermons, there is a quiet touch of humour in the following:—

'We find in them prefaces of inordinate length, porches larger than the buildings to which they lead; truisms repeated with a calm perseverance of dull repetition which is almost marvellous.'—P. 53.

'Very many clergymen live always upon this point in a sort of amiable dream; they speak, or they think they speak, very plainly in their sermons; their flocks exhibit no manifest symptoms of impatience or fatigue under their teaching;—for the forbearance with which our people listen to that which conveys scarcely an idea to them is really wonderful,—and they conclude that all which they have said has been pretty well understood; when if they were to converse closely with the greater number of their hearers, they would often find that scarcely a word of one of their best reasoned sermons had really found its way into their minds.'—P. 105.

On self-denial:—

'The creeping moss of soul-sluggishness can be kept off only by the continual acts of a vigorous self-denial.'—P. 137.

Here we have, in slightly different language, the mysterious truth concerning prayer, of which F. W. Faber has said,

'And schemes that ask no thought but then,
Wake up and meet me there.'

'For who has not known how some other duty rises at times suddenly before our eyes, when we are on our knees, with an urgency of importunity for its immediate discharge, and a pictured necessity for everything being set aside to secure its being instantly attended to, which bear no sort of relation to the estimate we should form of its importance when we are off our knees?'—Pp. 161, 162.

The following, on the influence of a holy life on others, is truly exquisite:—

'The secret influences of a holy life steal upon them as the early dews of morning, or the fragrance of incense coming they know not whence, and seizing upon the open sense before it has time to close itself against them.'—P. 195.

Here is psychology and theology in one:—

'God works through this unity of nature between those to whom He sends his message, and those whom He employs as his messengers.'—P. 196.

But our limits admonish us to turn to another side of the subject, on which we promised to hazard some suggestions. We have already pointed out the full justification there is in the

history and present condition of the Ordinal, for the predominantly subjective tone of these Addresses. It is a legitimate following out of the *prevailing* feeling of that rite. But it is inseparable from the very idea of such a rite, that we should have its objective side also, and so should suggest a wide field of kindred topics. We have referred before to Mr. Monro; and we think that we may not have been singular in the impression which his very earnest volume left upon us; which was no other than that which Imlac, in 'Rasselas,' left upon his hearer, when he had devoted a long discourse to a definition of the poetical office. 'Enough,' said the hearer; 'thou hast convinced me that no man can ever be a poet.' And Mr. Monro convinced us that no mortal man could ever be a parish priest of the type propounded by him. The thing was not merely difficult, but simply impossible. Bishop Wilberforce's ideal of a parish priest, set forth in these Addresses, is not so *exigant*, nor is it in any degree fantastic or unattainable. But we do conceive that it exhibits him as isolated and self-sustained beyond what is either natural or true. He is thrown for his support too solely on his inward struggles, his faith, his love, his prayer, his reality.

'Placed far amid the melancholy main,'

he seems to be buffeting single-handed with the waves of anxiety, of toil, of rebuke, that close in the man of God on every side. But is this a true picture? Is the parochial minister, or the priest of whatever occupation—whether in the world or the cell, in the cure or the college—is he in reality so isolated? Surely not. There is a link, a watch word, a *mot d'ordre*, which, in theory at least, binds him into fellowship with a mighty phalanx, marching with one step, 'none of them breaking their ranks,' keeping shoulder to shoulder, and moving on as one man. Do our readers apprehend us? As it is but too possible that they may not, we may be permitted then to remind them, that there is one thing, *though there is but one*, which the Clergy of this country, 'of every communion,' and without exception, are solemnly bound, under pain of infidelity to their Ordination vows, to do; and the obligation to do which is, and has been for many hundreds of years, throughout the whole Church, the *irrupta copula* of their fellowship, and their mark of distinction, in point of habits of life, from the laity. It is 'that they should say daily, morning and evening, prayer privately or 'openly.' A clergyman may never have a cure, may never be called upon to administer either sacrament in all his life, and may be blameless. But he cannot be in Holy Orders a single day, and not be bound to the performance of this, 'not being reason-

ably hindered.' In a cure, in college, at sea, in health, in sickness, abroad, it is all the same. The theory of the reformed, exactly as of the unreformed, Church of England is, that she has 20,000 clergy, or whatever their number may be, doing this, and bound to do it continually.

But we scorn to speak of it as an obligation. It is the salt of the clerical life. It is the purifier of it from the worldliness incident to a more laical round of existence. It is the refuge of the overworked from the dangers of having too much to do, and of the underworked from the dangers of having too little. It is the one half-hour rescued morning by morning and evening by evening from the turmoil of a busy life, the stagnation of a leisurely one. And surely its value, as securing the performance of a very large amount of real clerical work, is unquestionable. We speak, of course, of the spiritual works of mercy involved in the discharge of this duty. Bishop Wilberforce has taught us, with singular clearness and force, that in the wielding spiritual powers, of the 'powers of the world to come,' lies the very definition and essence of the Christian ministry. And where else, if we except the highest function of that ministry, the celebration of the Holy Eucharist, are they so potently wielded as in the continual Daily Office, public or private? What intercession for the flock, sick and well, is here;—what confession for or with them;—what absolving prayer or pronouncement for them;—what sense of fellowship with the whole Church, but specially with our own;—what security for the lifting up of morning incense and evening sacrifice! Or again, is there any one thing more conducive than this to sustained, and equable, and devotionally-imbibed knowledge of Holy Scripture? We may be permitted to doubt whether one person in a thousand does, out of his private rule laid down for himself, accomplish the reading as much as four chapters a day.

On all these accounts we should greatly marvel at finding that this most important and *solely obligatory* feature of the ministerial life obtains such slight (we must not say slighting) mention in this volume, were it not that the line of appeal taken up throughout it has a tendency to draw off the thoughts of this great subjective teacher from this topic. We feel that we may say with confidence that it is not true to the entire mind of him to whom we are listening, that this high ministerial duty and privilege should be assigned so indistinct and secondary a place. The founder of theological colleges and penitentiaries,—the earnest and large-hearted *fautor* of institutions of which daily prayer, joined to weekly communion, is the very life and soul, as well as the practice,—the Wyke-

ham no less than the Grostête of our day,—the rearer-up of solid institutions, no less than the proclaimer of vivid and surer life-truths, cannot undervalue this ordinance in many of its aspects. It can be only by an accident, arising out of the nature of this work, that though it is recognised as a rule, its dangers, on the side of formality, are referred to, while its great blessings are nowhere enlarged upon. We shall say no more, than that we humbly conceive that the Church is rueing sorely, at this day, the unfaithfulness of her Clergy to this duty; and that it pertains, as we do not hesitate to affirm, to the duty of archdeacons or their substitutes, as examining chaplains, to require a distinct pledge from every candidate for Holy Orders, that he will conscientiously fulfil the obligation in question.

And the mention of these functionaries of the Bishop suggests to us the further remark, that in proportion as the Ordination Office is now strongly subjective, hortatory in its tone, the previous instruction and examination, and perhaps also the Sermon itself, should be in a high degree *technical*: thus supplying these careful descriptions of the clerical office, which were contained, directly or indirectly, in the older forms.

It is not within our province to make any remark on the line adopted by the Bishop of Oxford, with reference to endeavours made of late years, not without many valuable results, in the matter of ritual. The revival of one distinction found in the ancient Ordinal, in East and West, between the two lower orders of Clergy, (the manner of wearing the stole,) has, we have understood, received his sanction, at least at Ordinations. This is a practical proof of interest in, and sympathy with, ritual features of our ancient Ordinal, which have with some loss disappeared from it.

We beg, in conclusion, to render our grateful thanks to the Right Reverend author for this standard contribution to our clerical literature. He must be a very careful, or a very careless minister of the Church—a very profound, or a very shallow reader of his own heart—who does not own to learning a great deal about himself and his duty, from these eloquent and luminous pages.

We subjoin the view, promised in a former part of this article, of the Eastern forms of Ordinations:—

The earliest form is in the Constitutions of Clemens Romanus, representing the discipline of the East before Constantine. (Morinus, p. 18.)

1. A person of blameless life must be chosen by all the people.

2. The people must come together, with the Presbytery and such Bishops as are there, *on a Sunday*.

3. The principal Bishop inquires if this person is their choice; and whether he is worthy, by general testimony, of this glorious presidency, for his piety, justice, *good government of his household*, and blamelessness of life.

4. A chief Bishop, accompanied by two others, stands near the altar; the other Bishops and priests praying in silence, and the deacons holding the open gospels over the head of him who is being ordained (*τοῦ χειροτονουμένου*), and says a prayer for the gift of the Holy Ghost, *in order to the remission of sins*, sending of Clergy, and *offering of Eucharistic sacrifice*.

5. One of the Bishops offers up, *upon the hands* of the *now ordained* Bishop (*τοῦ χειροτονηθέντος*) the element prepared for consecration.

We cite this form for ordaining a *Bishop* for its antiquity, and because the form for priests and deacons which follows in the same document is doubtless to be supplemented hence in many points. It is worthy of remark,

1. That it was to be on a Sunday, as now on a Sunday or holy day.

2. That he is supposed to be a householder or head of a family.

3. That though, singularly enough, there is no actual *direction* for the laying on of hands, this is doubtless accidental, as appears by comparing the forms for priests and deacons, which in turns prescribe this. And, in truth, it is virtually prescribed here in the words 'the deacons holding the Divine Gospels over the head of him *who is being ordained*;' for the word is *τοῦ χειροτονουμένου*: that is, precisely, 'who is receiving imposition of hands,' for though *χειροτονεῖν* is more properly used of the *election* of the Bishop, (Suicer in voce,) yet it is also applied in the Apostolic Canons to the *Ordination* itself. And we conceive that the tenses of this passage—so important may a tense become in the history of the Church—furnish the most certain and irrefragable proof that can be found anywhere of the position, that *Ordination is effected by the laying on of hands with prayer*. For the person is then said to be 'ordaining,' 'inter ordinandum:' but to be 'ordained,' 'ordinatus,' when the element is afterwards put into his hand.

We proceed to Eastern Ordination as performed in the eighth century, and probably far earlier, and to this day:—

I. *Bishops*. 1. After the Trisagion Hymn, the ordaining Archbishop reads a formula of election, standing on the foot-pace before the altar. The people pray 'Kyrie eleison.'

2. He holds the gospel over the elect's head and neck, the other Bishops standing by and holding the gospel.

3. Laying his hand on his head, he says a prayer 'that by the hand of me a sinner, and of the assisting Bishops, and by the coming of the Holy Ghost, he may,' &c.

4. One of the Bishops says a Litany, inserting a petition for the newly-ordained; the Archbishop still keeping his hand on the head, and saying another prayer for further gifts.

5. He places the pall (*ᾠμοφόριον*) on the newly-ordained.

6. He with the other Bishops gives the kiss, and they ascend their thrones, and the Liturgy is proceeded with.

II. *Priests.* 1. After the Cherubic Hymn, (the elements having first been brought in, and placed on the Holy Table,) the formula of election is read.

2. The elect kneels, and the Bishop makes the sign of the cross three times above him, and holding his hand on his head, prays for the Holy Spirit.

3. One of the priests says the Litany, inserting a petition for him.

4. The Bishop meanwhile still keeps his hand on his head, and afterwards prays that God who has willed that his servant should enter into the degree of the priesthood, will 'fill him with the gift of his Holy Spirit, that he be worthy to stand at the altar, preach the gospel, minister the word of truth, offer gifts and spiritual sacrifices, and renew his people by the laver of regeneration.'

5. The Ordaining Bishop brings the part of the priest's stole which hangs behind, to the front, puts on him the chasuble, and gives him the kiss. (Compare the English Ordinal: 'Hic reflectet Episcopus stolam super humerum eorum dextrum ad pectus:' and still more the Roman 'Pontifex,' below, 'reflectet orarium sive stolam ab humero sinistro, capiens partem quæ retrò pendet, et imponens super dextrum humerum,' and again Eng. and Rom. 'hic vestiat eos casulâ.')

6. After the 'It is meet and right,' the Archbishop gives the ordained priest one portion of bread from the paten into his hands, and causes him to lean over the holy table, holding the bread in his hands, and his head above it (Morinus, p. 62), and remaining so until the 'Sancta Sanctis' (just before reception) has been said, when he gives back the bread to the Archbishop, and communicates before all the other priests.

III. *Deacons.*—1. After the consecration of the elements follows threefold signing of the cross, imposition of the hands with prayer, Litany with special petition, renewed imposition and prayer for special gifts, as in ordination of priests.

2. Then putting on of the stole, and giving of the fan to fan with.

3. After receiving, the Deacon has the cup given him by the Bishop.

ART. VIII.—*The Trial of the Bishop of Brechin.* The DAILY COURANT, for March 15, 16, 17, 1860. (Edinburgh.)

FOR a whole year we have preserved the most entire silence with respect to the very existence of the Scottish controversy. We knew that our readers were weary of the subject, and consequently we have left unanswered all attacks, and ignored the very existence of some important pamphlets which bore upon the points at issue. The trial of a Bishop—assuredly one of the greatest theological cases that has occurred since the Reformation—may be fairly held to be a sufficient warrant for a fresh reference to a subject which has occupied so many of our pages during the years 1858 and 1859.

The shortness of the interval between the conclusion of the trial and the time at which this Review goes to the press, renders it impossible for us to consider the Opinions of the Judges, more especially as we have no documents before us beyond the necessarily brief reports of the Edinburgh newspapers. But it is only due to the bench to say that we have heard accounts, from those who were present, of the improved character of the proceedings, and of the courtesy of the arrangements regarding the accused prelate. Nor shall any risk of a seeming personality prevent us from referring to one member of the college, whose tone on former occasions has been made the subject of comment, both in these pages and in the perfectly independent columns of the *Guardian*. It is only due to the Bishop of St. Andrew's, to express our belief that no such criticisms as those to which we have alluded would ever have appeared in these pages, if he had always exhibited the tone and demeanour which is attributed to him during the late trial.

We turn from the bench to the presenters. It is sufficient for the present to remark, that these gentlemen must be considered to have sustained a signal defeat. Neither their friends, nor their opponents, nor bystanders, will ever believe that they took all this trouble, and spent the sums so liberally supplied to them, in order to procure a mere censure upon the Bishop of Brechin, by many degrees milder than that contained in the Pastoral of May, 1858. The court at large implicitly, and one member of it (the Bishop of Moray) avowedly, appear to have declined any sanction of the positive teaching of the presenters

respecting the fundamental verity at stake, the Real Presence in the Eucharist.

And meanwhile, what has been the effect upon those without? Two years ago, an impression was prevalent in many quarters to the effect that the Bishop of Brechin and Mr. Cheyne had effectually cut themselves off from the reach of any very marked or extensive sympathy. At the moment when we write, *more than ten thousand persons*, partly from personal affection, partly from agreement on fundamental truths, have shown their disapproval of anything like suspension upon such grounds. It is probable that the number above mentioned represents about one-fifth part of those who substantially agree in the sentiment. Thousands have stood aloof, because they did not feel called upon to mix themselves up with the matter. The names of the absent must not be ranked with those of approvers of a penal sentence. No one, for example, will for a moment imagine that Archdeacon Churton, or Dr. Pusey, or Mr. Keble, would have sympathised with any penal sentence. Yet their names are not appended to any of the numerous addresses presented to the Bishop of Brechin or Mr. Cheyne. How many have, naturally enough, followed the example set by these distinguished persons! How many more, even though partially or widely disagreeing with the accused, would concur in deprecating the principle of limitation which penal condemnation must involve!

It is impossible, notwithstanding our scanty limits, to pass by the extraordinary historical fact of the monster address to Bishop Forbes from the working-men of all denominations in Dundee. That in the country where Popery and *black Prelacy* used to be placed on the same level, and the office regarded almost as a sign of antichrist, a bishop should receive such a testimony to the impression which his life and labours have made upon the masses, is in itself a truly astonishing event. But the circumstances are such as to tend greatly to increase the measure of our surprise. If, thirty years ago, any one had ventured to speak of the possibility of such an address from Scotchmen to a Scottish Bishop, the natural comment would have been, that, if so very improbable an event did take place, the recipient of sympathy would prove to be one who had minimised the differences between Episcopacy and Presbyterianism, who had espoused what was the most popular school of theology in his own communion, and thus won the favour of the lairds and of the populace. But that a bishop who had, more than any other member of the college, brought out into strong relief the contrast between the two systems, and who was actually on his trial for teaching the unpopular view, should obtain such tokens

of sympathy, is one of those occurrences which *à priori* seem absolutely incredible, and which could not have been brought to pass but for the kind offices of Mr. Henderson and his co-presenters.

On one point, on which the language of the Bishop of Brechin had been (as we think it must be admitted) of a trenchant character, he had proposed a substitution. Instead of the words 'the sacrifice of the Cross and the sacrifice of the Altar are substantially one,' and 'in some transcendental sense identical,' the Bishop offered to substitute the following language of S. Cyril. (This, we presume, must be the 'modification' alluded to in the finding of the court in reference to the first charge.)

'We celebrate in the Churches the unbloody sacrifice, and so we approach to the mystic eulogies and are sanctified, being here made partakers of the holy flesh, and of the precious blood of Christ, the Saviour of all. And we receive it, not as common flesh, God forbid! nor indeed that of a sanctified man, and one associated with the Divinity by unity of dignity, nor as one that hath the Divinity dwelling within Him, but as the truly life-giving and proper flesh of the Word Himself.'—*Ep. Syn. Alex.* T. v. p. ii. *Epp.* p. 72.

It is gratifying to observe that these words appear to have been accepted by the court, one member (the Bishop of St. Andrew's) declaring, in a most emphatic manner, not merely his admission of the statement, but 'his thorough consent to S. Cyril's language.' When we call to mind the circumstance, that certain statements made in the Pastoral of May, 1858, were thought, in high quarters, to be such as, if developed, would tend to Nestorianism, it is no light matter for congratulation to witness the admission of phraseology employed by the great opponent of Nestorius. In making this change, Bishop Forbes expresses himself as follows: 'Now let me not be misunderstood, Right Reverend Brethren, what I now say, I say out of 'the love of peace. . . I have no wish to adhere to any forms of 'expressing my belief, so that I express that belief distinctly, 'and the Church, and those committed to my charge, know what 'I believe.' Our readers will allow us to remind them of the somewhat similar language which emanated from the great S. Athanasius. Would that it may prove in all respects applicable! 'Those who accept everything else that was 'defined at Nicæa, and quarrel only about the *One-in-substance*, 'must not be received as enemies; nor do we attack them as 'Ariomaniacs, nor as opponents of the Fathers; but we discuss 'the matter with them as brothers with brothers, who mean what 'we mean, and dispute only about the words.'¹

¹ Epistle on Councils of Ariminum and Seleucia. Chap. III (p. 138, Oxf. Tr.)

On the whole, we have deep reason to be thankful for a judgment which is so vast an improvement on that delivered in the case of Mr. Cheyne, and on the language of the Pastoral of 1858, and which extends judicial toleration so far. It has indeed been said to those who think with us, Do you seek toleration only? With regard to that, we are content to answer: 'If 'this counsel, or this work, be of men, it will come to nought: 'but if it be of God, ye cannot overthrow it; lest, haply, ye be 'found even to fight against God.'

But certainly, we are unable to see any such amount of difference between the cases of the Bishop of Brechin and Mr. Cheyne, as to justify the continued exclusion of the latter from the office of the ministry. There are not wanting those, who attribute the more lenient treatment of the former, to the fact of his being a brother bishop, to his ancient name, powerful friends, and aristocratic connexions. We do not, for our own part, believe this. We attribute the difference to the effects of time, the gradual influence of arguments, the sympathy for the accused, and the dread of a schism; above all, to the conviction in the mind of the court, that there were real *forensic* distinctions between the two cases.

In conclusion. As to the terms of the *finding* of the court—over and above what has been already said on alleged 'modifications,' we cannot, in justice either to the judges or the accused, refrain from making a few brief remarks. As to the former, it is quite clear that they so far coincided with the respondent in viewing the question only from the narrower issue of the *explicit* teaching of the Formularies, which cannot *de facto* be held as enforcing, as terms of communion or ministration, his own statements of the *juge sacrificium*, or Eucharistic Adoration. But the court, in assuming that the respondent did not 'claim the authority of the Church' for the doctrines he had advocated, but promulgated them only as private opinions overstepped (except under the reservation before stated) the candid and charitable statements of the Bishop of Brechin. On this point, the minds of the judges and of the accused were certainly not in the same plane; to the latter, the Eucharistic doctrines contained in his charge, were *negatively* what the court stated them to be—no terms of communion, no *point de départ* for persecution, but *positively* the tradition of the Catholic Fathers and ancient Bishops, and no mere private opinions.¹

¹ At no time has he either exceeded this claim, or fallen short of it; a fact, which makes us regret that the word 'now' as contained in the Finding, should *prima facie* seem to involve any retrograde position as assumed by the respondent.

But viewing the matter broadly and in all its bearings, it must be admitted that, considering the extent to which the Pastoral Letter had already committed the Bishops who formed the court to a decision adverse to the accused, a milder and more tolerant judgment could hardly have been anticipated; nor would we fail to do justice to the profession made in the name of the court at the opening of the proceedings, that they would be prepared to give a candid and favourable consideration to the pleadings of the respondent, a pledge which, if not to the extent that we could have desired, they have yet in some considerable measure practically redeemed.

Let our readers weigh what would have been their own feelings, had the highest appellate tribunal in England conceded 'toleration' to the teaching of the Archdeacon of Taunton, balanced only by a mild censure and admonition; and let them not, with the antecedents of the last three hundred years before them, shrink from seeing dogmatic truth rest, for a season, on its *de facto* historic basis within our communion, until on her behalf be granted to the full the prayer which thousands have uttered in the words of the saintly Andrew's, *ut in eâ suppleantur defectus, confirmentur reliqua.*

ART. IX.—*Codex Liturgicus Ecclesiæ Orientalis.* Curavit
HERM. ADALB. DANIEL. Lipsiæ: T. O. Weigel.

ONE of the first observations which must occur to a student of the primitive Liturgies is this: how frequent are the quotations from Scripture with which they abound. We know, in fact, that the few Protestant writers who have advanced, even so far as to a respectable knowledge of these works, have never been weary of proclaiming their scriptural character—of pointing out that, although Antichrist was already beginning to whimper in his cradle, nevertheless reference was still made ‘to the law and to the testimony.’

The so-called sect of Evangelicals, again, would find a still closer resemblance between liturgical quotations and their own. The passages cited are not, to use the words of an Evangelical Bishop, ‘from the Gospels, or the other less important books of the New Testament,’ but are mainly from the Pauline Epistles. Reference may indeed be here and there made to a gospel fact—or some of our LORD’s promises may be pleaded with Him by Whom they were spoken. But still, as the rule, if a citation, not avowedly such, be made from Scripture, it is three times out of four from the Epistles.

But another view of the subject may be taken, and it is that to which we are at present about to direct the reader’s attention. We have before now remarked that the Liturgical articles of this periodical must be regarded as a connected series; and it is therefore our desire to repeat as little as possible in a later, what may already have been discussed in a former, paper. We shall, then, make no apology for now assuming points as proved, which, on previous occasions, we have endeavoured to establish. And we cannot but be thankful for the kindness with which our endeavours to trace liturgical analogies, and to elucidate ritual difficulties, have been received by our readers. On the present occasion we shall not have to trespass so long on their time, perhaps not so deeply on their study, as in some foregoing numbers.

The question then for our present consideration is this:—The passages which occur in the original portions of the primitive Liturgies, and also in the Epistles,—are we to regard them as quoted in the latter from the former, or in the former from the latter?

The offhand reply would of course be—Undoubtedly the liturgical is a quotation from the scriptural passage. A deeper view of the subject may perhaps lead us to a different conclusion.

It need hardly be said that, if this be the case, Liturgies become at once invested with a dignity and majesty, scarcely inferior to that of the New Testament itself.

The question is one which has never yet been discussed at length. The late Professor Blunt—and would that he had been spared to follow out the path which he had indicated!—opened up this inquiry; and that with a manifest bias to the liturgical side of its decision. We will endeavour—*haud passibus æquis*—to follow in his steps.

One of the cleverest critical essays, written during the last century, is that of Hurd, afterwards Bishop of Worcester, on the marks of poetical imitation. In this he professes to lay down a series of canons by which we may judge whether an apparent imitation is a real plagiarism or not. We shall find some of his remarks very useful to carry with us as we go along: although our present question is not whether there be imitation or not, but in which of two given writings that imitation is to be found.

In the first place it is well to observe that, without any manner of doubt, scriptural writers are in the habit of quoting, not only heathen authors, as in the three examples which S. Paul affords from Aratus, from Simonides, and from Epimenes, but also from the ecclesiastical compositions of that era. For example: *It is a faithful saying:*

For if we be dead with Him,
We shall also live with Him;
If we suffer,
We shall also reign with Him;
If we deny Him,
He also will deny us.
If we believe not,
Yet He abideth faithful.

Or again: *This is a faithful saying, and worthy of all acceptance, that*

CHRIST JESUS came into the world
To save sinners.

And yet again:

Godliness is profitable unto all things:
Having the promise of the life that now is,
And of that which is to come.
This is a faithful saying, and worthy of all acceptance.

And yet again, the most remarkable instance of all:

Wherefore he saith:
Awake, thou that sleepest,
And arise from the dead,
And CHRIST shall give thee life.

As we have had occasion to observe in a previous paper, we know both the occasion on which the hymn, of which these words form a part, was written; we know its metre, or rather quasi metre; we have its melody at this day; and we have the Latin metrical translation of the whole hymn.

We have seen that, from external as well as internal evidence, it may be shown that the framework—the general order, and the more important prayers—of the two *most* primitive Liturgies, S. Mark and S. James, is not only older than A.D. 100, but in fact is really owing to the supposed authors. Well, then, the Epistles, and the main features and most important prayers of these Liturgies, are of the same age; whence the question arises, Why should not passages identical in the two be *as well* quoted by the Scriptural, as by the Liturgical writers? To say the least, the chances are even. But we will go a great deal further.

In the Liturgy of S. Mark, the *Embolismus*, that is, the prayer which follows the Lord's Prayer, runs thus:—

Ναί, Κύριε, Κύριε, μὴ εἰσενέγκῃς ἡμᾶς εἰς πειρασμὸν, ἀλλὰ ῥῶσαι ἡμᾶς ἀπὸ τοῦ ποιηροῦ. Οἶδεν γὰρ ἡ πολλὴ σου εὐσπλαγχνία, ὅτι οὐ δύναμεθα ὑπενεγκεῖν διὰ τὴν πολλὴν ἡμῶν ἀσθένειαν· ἀλλὰ ποιήσον σὺν τῷ πειρασμῷ καὶ ἔκβασιν, τοῦ δύνασθαι ἡμᾶς ὑπενεγκεῖν. Σὺ ΓΑΡ ἔδωκας ἡμῖν ἐξουσίαν πατεῖν ἐπάνω ὀφείων καὶ σκορπίων, καὶ ἐπὶ πᾶσαν τὴν δύναμιν τοῦ ἐχθροῦ.

The parallel passage is, of course, to be found in 1 Cor. x. 13 :

Πιστὸς δὲ ὁ Θεός, ὃς οὐκ ἔασει ὑμᾶς πειρασθῆναι ὑπὲρ ὃ δύνασθε, ἀλλὰ ποιήσει σὺν τῷ πειρασμῷ καὶ τὴν ἔκβασιν, τοῦ δύνασθαι ὑμᾶς ὑπενεγκεῖν.

Now we would observe, in the first place, that the *Embolismus* is a prayer which occurs in every known Liturgy (except the Clementine), and always on the same subject—deliverance from temptations. Alone of all early Liturgies, S. Mark has any recognition of this most appropriate promise. Why? No doubt, because *that promise was not in existence when most of those Liturgies were composed*. S. Paul—as we have had occasion to point out—was more especially connected with S. Mark and the Alexandrian Liturgy. He then was aware of the petition; and how beautiful is the idea that naturally follows! ‘Make the way to escape, O LORD, with the temptation!’ had been the earnest and repeated prayer of S. Peter’s converts, in their first exposure to the axe, the fire, the lion’s teeth. That petition was offered with the much incense on the Golden Altar; and Paul was inspired to declare it fulfilled. ‘God is faithful, Who with the temptation *will* make the way to escape.’ Read calmly that chapter in 1 Corinthians after the above representation, and see how completely the promise has the air of a quotation.

We said that, had the said promise been in existence when the earlier *embolismi* were written, it would have been referred to in others of them. This must be allowed *probable*; but is it not next to *certain* that, in the other edition of S. Mark's Liturgy—such as the rites afterwards called from S. Gregory, S. Basil, S. Cyril—so apposite a promise, had it then been one, must have been inserted? Yet it is not.

And again, we place great reliance on that *γὰρ*, which we have printed in capital letters. The writer, in the *Embolismus*, clearly wished to plead with God. He does *not* plead the far more decisive promise (though he quotes it, if the theory of quotation be true), but he adduces one far less to the point, and begins with the *For*, as applied to it, which seems to tell us that he was not pleading before. Is not this conclusive? So conclusive, in our judgment, that it is scarcely worth while to notice the addition of the article in the Epistle, its absence in the Liturgy. 'Make a way to escape,' says the latter. 'He will make the way to escape,'—the way so often petitioned for, says the former.

We have still another passage worthy of all notice, from S. Mark. In the Prayer for the King we read: 'That he also, 'in the tranquillity of his days, may lead a quiet and peaceable life, in all godliness and honesty.' And now see how beautifully these two things work in together. In a former paper we endeavoured to show that in this letter to Timothy, S. Paul was laying down his rule for the Alexandrian Liturgy. In some rituals, as we know, no intercession was made till just before the words of Institution; in some, partly before, partly after them; in some, between the Institution and the Invocation; in some, between the Invocation and the Lord's Prayer, and this last may be called the rule of the Church. But S. Paul, whom we have seen so often referring to S. Mark's Liturgy, would have its norm kept to on this point. 'I exhort, therefore,' says he, 'that FIRST OF ALL, supplications'—which we take to be *Ectenai*—'prayers, intercessions, and giving of thanks, be made for all men, for kings, and for all that are in authority.' And S. Mark's Liturgy, alone of all others, has its second prayer for the King. With this in his mind, the Apostle goes on, 'that we may lead a quiet and peaceable life, in all godliness 'and honesty;' quoting, as was natural, that Liturgy, the use of which he was recommending.

Then again, there is that remarkable expression about 'being purified from all filthiness, both of flesh and spirit,' which occurs so often in the Clementine Liturgy. Here we confess that we fully believe the Epistle of S. Paul to be the earlier. And one reason is this: we find no trace of quotation from the

Clementine Liturgy in any of S. Paul's writings; and we do find the other part of the verse, 'perfecting holiness in the fear of God,' referred to in that Liturgy. It is far more likely that its compiler should have, in two different places, quoted the same verse of S. Paul, than that S. Paul should in one verse have knit together two expressions of S. Clement.

Now then, we have a most remarkable instance—so remarkable, that we shall give it in English as well as in Greek.

In 1 Cor. ii. 9, we have this passage:—

'But AS IT IS WRITTEN, Eye hath not seen, nor ear heard, neither have entered into the heart of man, the things which God hath prepared for them that love Him.'

Where is this written? 'Why,' they say, 'in Isaiah lxiv. 4.' Now we do not deny that, *so far as our English version is concerned*, there is a certain resemblance between the passage in the Corinthians, and that in Isaiah. But it is now universally allowed that our English version of the text in Isaiah is quite indefensible; it probably was only made from the predetermination of considering S. Paul to be giving the right sense of the prophet; and the true version is given in the margin. Let us see how the passage stands in the LXX., which S. Paul must have quoted, and which gives the correct interpretation of the Hebrew:—

'From the beginning have we not heard, neither have our eyes seen, a God beside Thee, and Thy works, which Thou shalt do to them that wait for mercy.'

There is not much likeness here; but we will go a great deal further yet. However, let us first hear what Bishop Lowth says on the matter. His version is:—

'For never have men heard, nor perceived by the ear,
Nor eye hath seen, a God beside Thee,
Who doeth such things for those that trust in Him.'

His note is:—

'For never have men heard—] S. Paul is generally supposed to have quoted this passage of Isaiah, 1 Cor. ii. 9: and Clemens Romanus in his First Epistle has made the same quotation, very nearly in the same words with the Apostle. But the citation is so very different, both from the Hebrew Text and the Version of the LXX., that it seems very difficult, if not impossible, to reconcile them by any literal emendation, without going beyond the bounds of temperate criticism. One clause, "neither hath it entered into the heart of man," is wholly left out; and another is repeated without force or propriety, viz. "nor perceived by the ear," after "never have heard:" and the sense and expression of the Apostle is far preferable to that of the Hebrew text. Under these difficulties, I am at a loss what to do better, than to offer to the reader this, perhaps disagreeable, alternative—either to consider the Hebrew text and LXX. in

this place as wilfully disguised and corrupted by the Jews: of which practice, in regard to other quotations in the New Testament from the Old, they lie under strong suspicions: (see Dr. Owen, on the Version of the Seventy, sect vi.—ix.): or to look upon S. Paul's quotation as not made from Isaiah, but from one or other of the two Apocryphal Books, entitled The Ascension of Esaias, and the Apocalypse of Elias, in both of which this passage was found: and the Apostle is by some supposed in other places to have quoted such apocryphal writings. As the first of these conclusions will perhaps not easily be admitted by many; so I must fairly warn my readers, that the second is treated by Jerom as little better than heresy. See his Comment on this place in Isaiah.'

Now we will see if we cannot explain what so completely puzzled—and it is to his great credit he confesses it—Bishop Lowth.

First, here is the version of the LXX. :—

Ἀπὸ τοῦ αἰῶνος οὐκ ἤκούσαμεν, οὐδὲ οἱ ὀφθαλμοὶ ἡμῶν εἶδον Θεὸν πλήν σου, καὶ τὰ ἔργα σου, ἃ ποιῇσεις τοῖς ὑπομένουσιν ἔλεον.

Now, S. Paul—

Ἀλλὰ καθὼς γέγραπται· ὁ ὀφθαλμὸς οὐκ εἶδε, καὶ οὐς οὐκ ἤκουσε, καὶ ἐπὶ καρδίᾳ ἀνθρώπου οὐκ ἀνέβη, ἃ ἠτοίμασεν ὁ Θεὸς τοῖς ἀγαπῶσιν αὐτόν.

Observe (1), that there is not ONE WORD, literally not ONE WORD, the same in Isaiah and in S. Paul.

(2). Nevertheless, this is manifestly a textual quotation. We say nothing of the *καθὼς γέγραπται*· but the ungrammatical structure of the sentence, the relative without an antecedent, the beginning with Ὁ ὀφθαλμὸς οὐκ εἶδε,—shows that it is a mere fragment, taken bodily from some other writer. The English reader will understand this better, if we translate—what our version has not done—literally :—

But as it hath been written :—‘ Which eye hath not seen, and ear hath not heard, and into the heart of man hath not ascended,—which God hath prepared for them that love Him.’

You see it is manifestly a broken sentence—an exact textual reproduction of some passage where the first *which*—‘ which eye hath not seen,’ must have had an antecedent. Cast your eyes back to the literal version of the LXX., and you will now agree that S. Paul *could not* have been quoting Isaiah; and *was* quoting some one else—that some one else, in all probability, distantly referring to the prophet.

This we should confidently say, even if we could not find what S. Paul was quoting.

Can we find it?

Turn to the Anaphora of S. James, (p. 63 of NEALE's little edition).

Now then—

Ἄλλα κατὰ τὴν σὴν ἐπιείκειαν καὶ ἀφαιτόν σου φιλανθρωπίαν, ὑπερβὰς καὶ ἐξαλείψας τὸ καθ' ἡμῶν χειρόγραφον τῶν σῶν ἱκετῶν, χάρισθ' ἡμῖν τὰ ἰπουράνια καὶ αἰωνία σου δωρηματα, ἃ ὀφθαλμὸς οὐκ εἶδε, καὶ οὖς οὐκ ἤκουσε, καὶ ἐπὶ καρδίαν ἀνθρώπου οὐκ ἀνέβη, ἃ ἡτοίμασας, ὁ Θεὸς, τοῖς ἀγαπῶσί σε· καὶ μὴ δι' ἐμέ, καὶ διὰ τὰς ἐμὰς ἁμαρτίας ἀβετήσης τὸν λαόν, φιλάνθρωπε Κύριε.

Now we have the textual quotation. Now we can explain the want of an antecedent to the relative. Now the *ἀ* refers to τὰ σου ἀγαθά.

We translate for the English reader :—

‘But according to Thy gentleness and measureless love, passing over and blotting out the handwriting against us Thy suppliants, Thou wouldst bestow on us Thy heavenly and eternal gifts, WHICH eye hath not seen, and ear hath not heard, and into the heart of man hath not ascended, which Thou hast prepared, O God, for them that love Thee.’

Is it not now absolutely certain—certain beyond all assurance—that *this* is the passage which S. Paul was quoting? This passage may very probably glance at Isaiah, though only distantly. This is so very important that we repeat the argument.

1. There is not one word the same in the passage in the Corinthians, and in that of Isaiah—and the sense is altogether different.

2. Yet the passage in the Corinthians is a textual quotation—textual even to ungrammaticalness.

3. The exact words of this quotation, the ungrammaticalness supplied, occur in the Liturgy of S. James. Is not this certainly of the deepest moment? Surely it is. It establishes, first, that the Liturgy of S. James—or at least some part of it—was in existence before A.D. 59.

But more: people say, if you argue with them on such subjects as Prayers for the Dead, or the True Sacrifice in the Eucharist, from Primitive Liturgies, ‘Oh yes! but granting the antiquity of the principal parts of the Liturgy, *these* are insertions!’ Now here we find S. Paul actually quoting, and stamping with the infallible seal of the HOLY GHOST’S approval, a prayer which calls the Blessed Eucharist ‘this fearful and unbloody Sacrifice.’ On this point there can be now no doubt. And the only marvel is that the discovery has not been made before.

Observe also, that according to the usual reckoning, that Epistle to the Corinthians was written in 59; the Epistle to the Colossians not till 64. Therefore, if in the former letter the Apostle introduced a Liturgical quotation, much more might he have done so in the latter. Now, we have just had the

following passage: 'Beseeching Thee that Thou wouldst not deal with us after our sins, nor reward us according to our iniquities, but according to Thy gentleness and ineffable love, passing by and blotting out the handwriting which is against us, Thy suppliants, wouldst grant us Thy heavenly and eternal gifts.' This is word for word the same as that expression in the Colossians (ii. 14): 'Blotting out the handwriting of ordinances that was against us, which was contrary to us: a passage manifestly borrowed from this Liturgy, and in which the word χειρόγραφον occurs, nowhere else to be met with in the New Testament.

We will now take another example.

In that most magnificent commencement of the anaphora in S. James's Liturgy, we have the expression:—

*Ὁν ὑμνοῦσιν οἱ οὐρανοὶ Ἱερουσαλὴμ ἡ ἐπουρανίους, ἐκκλησία πρωτοτόκων ἀπογεγραμμένων ἐν τοῖς οὐρανοῖς, πνεύματα δικαίων καὶ προφητῶν.

The parallel passage in S. Paul is (Heb. xv. 22):—

*Ἀλλὰ προσελήλυθατε Σιών ὅρει, καὶ πόλει Θεοῦ ζῶντος, Ἱερουσαλὴμ ἐπουρανίῳ, καὶ μυριάσιν ἀγγέλων, πανηγύρει καὶ ἐκκλησίᾳ πρωτοτόκων ἐν οὐρανοῖς ἀπογεγραμμένων, καὶ πνεύμασι δικαίων τετελειωμένων.

Now, we might observe, that the word πανήγυρις nowhere else occurs in the New Testament; nor is the term πρωτοτόκος elsewhere employed in that sense.

We might also remark, that this Epistle was written to the Hebrews, i.e. the very Church which employed S. James's Liturgy. But when we know that S. James's Liturgy is quoted in the First Epistle to the Corinthians, and that the latter is earlier than the Epistle to the Hebrews, *cadit questio*, the Epistle must quote the Liturgy.

Further, when we take the passage as a reference to the crowning act of Christian life—its approach to, and union with, our blessed LORD in the Liturgy, what force do we give the comparison! 'Your fathers in the wilderness—for them there was the mount that burned with fire, the blackness, and darkness, and tempest, and the sound of a trumpet, when they drew near to God. For you, according to the words which you daily take in your mouths, there is the Heavenly Jerusalem opened, the myriads of angels invisibly attending, the general assembly and church of the firstborn united and uniting in your earthly sacrifice.' Once take the passage thus, and does not any other interpretation seem impossible? Imagine the Liturgy to be the copy, and S. Paul's words lose half their force.

We may bring forward another passage from S. James (page 65 of NEALE'S Edition): 'Remember also, O LORD, our holy

‘fathers and brothers in it [the Church], and the Bishops that in all the world rightly divide the Word of Truth.’ It occurs also in S. Mark, in the third prayer in the Ante-Communion (page 9 of NEALE’s little Edition). ‘We beseech and supplicate Thee, O Lover of men, O good God, for [our most holy and blessed Pontiff, the Pope N. and] the most sacred Bishop N., preserve them to us peacefully many years, executing the holy Arch-priesthood intrusted by Thee to them, according to Thy holy and blessed word, rightly dividing the Word of Truth.’ From this passage S. Paul must have quoted his injunction to S. Timothy, ‘Study to show thyself approved unto God, a workman that needeth not to be ashamed, rightly dividing the word of Truth.’ We know that S. Paul must have been quoting S. James:—as again, the Second Epistle to Timothy is so much later than the First to the Corinthians.

Now there is another point in which the three Gospels and the three Primitive Liturgies may most profitably be compared: we mean the words of Institution of the Blessed Sacrament.

S. Matthew gives them thus:—

‘Take, eat: This is My Body.

‘Drink ye all of it: for this is My Blood of the New Testament which is shed for many for the remission of sins.’

S. Mark thus:—

‘Take, eat, This is My Body.

‘This is My Blood of the New Testament which is shed for many.’

S. Luke thus:—

‘This is My Body which is given for you: This do in remembrance of Me:

‘This Cup is the New Testament in My Blood which is shed for you.’

And S. Paul, in the First Epistle to the Corinthians:—

‘Take, eat: This is My Body which is broken for you, This do in remembrance of Me.

‘This Cup is the New Testament in My Blood: This do ye, as oft as ye drink it, in remembrance of Me.’

Now compare these with the Liturgies.

S. Mark:—

‘Take, eat. For this is My Body which is broken for you, and distributed for the remission of sins.

‘Drink ye all of this. This is My Blood of the New Testament, which is shed and distributed for you and for many for the remission of sins.’

S. James:—

‘Take, eat: This is My Body which is broken for you, and is given for the remission of sins.

‘Drink ye all of this: This is My Blood of the New Testament, which for you and for many is shed and distributed for the remission of sins.’

S. Clement:—

‘This is the mystery of the New Testament; take of it; eat; this is My Body, which is broken for many for the remission of sins.

‘Drink ye all of it: this is My Blood, which is shed for many for the remission of sins; do this in remembrance of Me; for as often as ye eat of this bread, and drink of this cup, ye do show forth My death till I come.’

If the reader will compare the Apostolic account of these words with those delivered to us by the Evangelists, he cannot fail to see how much S. Paul borrowed from the Liturgies. Also in the accessory circumstances of that first Sacrament, we cannot doubt that the most important were recorded by eye-witnesses. Who else would have ventured to specify that fact which almost every Liturgy notices, that our LORD, before consecrating the Elements into his own Body and Blood, lifted up his eyes to heaven? Who else would have put into writing that which the tradition of every primitive Church, except the Armenian, confirms in practice, that He mingled water with the wine: which from other sources we know to have been the practice of the Jews in their Passover celebration? Whatever may be the truth of that other assertion, authorised by S. Augustine, that He Himself received,—it comes to us with far less liturgical evidence than the circumstances we have already noticed. Notice, also, how completely the Invocation of the HOLY GHOST, in the Liturgy of S. James, has the air of being written by an eye-witness of that first Pentecost, and not put together from the details afforded us in the Acts. In Scripture we only find that the Apostles ‘were all with one accord in one place:’ in the Liturgy we are told that it was ‘in the upper room of the holy and glorious Sion.’ One would not lay much stress on the words of Institution,—‘He gave thanks, and hallowed, and blessed, and filled with the HOLY GHOST, and gave it to us His Disciples’—because the pronoun might have been inserted as a pious fraud. Yet it is worth remark that in the Liturgy which comes nearest to a pious fraud, namely, the Clementine—for no one ever believed that the portions assigned by its rubrics to the various Apostles were really written by them—this word *us* does not occur. Also, had it been composed at a later time, the writer would, probably, have given the more, instead of the less, honourable name; would have written, ‘to us His Apostles,’ instead of ‘to us His Disciples.’

And now notice another evident quotation. In the Liturgy of S. James, just before the commencement of the Anaphora,

we have the Prayer of the Veil—a prayer which finds its place in every family of that race. It refers to the moment when the Veil is now raised, and the Holy Mysteries—Holy, because already offered, though not yet consecrated—are exposed to view. Here we have the passage: ‘We render thanks to Thee, LORD our God, for that Thou hast given us boldness to the entrance in of thy Holy Places, the true and living way which Thou hast consecrated to us through the Veil of Thy CHRIST.’ We, now knowing that the Epistle to the Hebrews is of a subsequent period to this Liturgy, immediately find two quotations from this same prayer. The one (x. 19, 20), ‘Having, therefore, brethren, boldness to enter into the Holiest’—and see how the Apostle is not only about to quote the words, but has the living idea before his eyes—‘by the Blood of JESUS, by a new and living way which He hath consecrated for us through the Veil, that is to say, His Flesh, and having an High Priest over the House of God, let us draw near with a true heart.’ Draw near? To what? Surely to nothing else than the Liturgy itself. For see how presently afterwards the Apostle goes on, ‘Let us hold fast the profession of our faith without wavering,’—that profession, namely, which has just been made in the Creed. And once more, ‘not forsaking the assembling ourselves together,’ which undoubtedly refers to Holy Communion. We very much doubt whether that passage, ‘Having an High Priest over the House of God,’ which is generally understood to apply to our LORD, does not in reality mean the Celebrant in the Liturgy. For we have had a reference to the Prayer of the Veil; we have another to that physical ablution, ‘our bodies washed with pure water,’ which was then the universal custom, as we learn from S. Cyril, before attendance at the Liturgy. In fact, the more these verses (Heb. ix. 19—27) are studied, the more it will be seen that they cannot be fully explained without an application to the Liturgy. A little further on in the Prayer of the Veil, we have this expression: ‘Master, have mercy upon us, since we are full of fear and dread when about to stand before Thy Holy Altar, and to offer this fearful and unbloody Sacrifice for our sins, and for the ignorances of the people.’ To this phrase S. Paul refers no less than three times: Heb. v. 3; vii. 27; and ix. 7; in the last passage, indeed, all but quoting it; ‘which he offered for himself, and for the ignorances of the people.’

The above are a few of the most striking examples where Scriptural writers seem to have quoted Primitive Liturgies. Nothing can be urged against our hypothesis from the allowed fact that, for many years, those Liturgies were not committed to

writing. They were of course so well known by every Christian, that their transcription was in those early times unnecessary; and only afterwards rendered requisite, by the addition of varying Troparia, Antiphons, and hymns, which could not so well be retained by heart. We have no doubt that we have here opened a vein which will afford much precious ore to other inquirers: and let it be remembered, that every such quotation made in any degree probable has a tendency to make the next discovery still more probable. One apparent similarity *might* be a coincidence; ten or twelve become certainties. We are most willing to allow that we should *à priori* have expected some reference somewhere to two of the most striking and earliest features of Primitive Liturgies, namely, the *Sursum Corda*, and the *Sancta Sanctis*. It would have been so very natural to find an allusion to the first in such passages as that (Col. iii. 1): 'If ye then be risen with CHRIST, seek those things which are above.' But surely the fact that we do not discover more quotations, cannot be adduced as an argument against our having discovered any.

And then observe the great force which accrues to those passages in S. Paul which are thus interpreted by a Liturgical light. The same thing may be said of those texts which refer to some Jewish ceremony or right—too often forgotten by us. To give two examples only. How abruptly, to any one not acquainted with the circumstances, does our LORD's conversation with Nicodemus begin,—'Verily, verily, I say unto thee, Except 'a man be born of water and of the Spirit, he cannot enter into 'the kingdom of God!' But when we are told that one of the most important among the Temple offices was that which was denominated the Priesthood of the Water, and which involved the duty of providing the enormous quantity of water required for Sacrifices and Purifications,—and that this office was at that time actually held by Nicodemus,—how natural and simple does all become! And how much force is added to our LORD's subsequent question, 'Art thou a Master in Israel, and knowest not these things?' As if He had said, 'Hast thou the Priesthood 'of the Waters, an office of so much importance and dignity, 'and yet knowest thou not the mystery that is concealed under 'those very waters with which thou art concerned?' Again, when we are told that at the examination of young priests in order to their admittance to priestly offices, the successful candidates were clothed with white, while the names of the unsuccessful were erased from the rent-roll of the Temple, what force does it give to those words of S. John, 'He that over- 'cometh, the same shall be clothed in white raiment, and I will

‘not blot out his name from the Book of Life!’ We doubt not that many such hints may be gathered from the Four Primitive Liturgies—that of S. James, that of S. Mark, in some degree the Clementine, and in a less degree still the Roman; not because the latter has a more recent origin, but because it has been so much more altered. No one could do a greater service to the study of Liturgies, than to institute a thorough investigation, searching on the one hand, not fanciful on the other, into this very interesting matter. We have commenced it.

NOTICES.

[In consequence of the length of our Articles this quarter, we are compelled to omit the greater part of our shorter Notices.—Ed. C. R.]

'A Lecture on Lord Strafford, by the Rev. Arthur Cazenove' (Simpkin and Marshall), is a spirited and well-arranged defence of the career and character of that famous statesman. The view taken by the lecturer coincides in great measure with that put forth in a brilliant article of the *British Critic* for April, 1843; and the coincidence is the more satisfactory, inasmuch as it seems to us most probable that Mr. A. Cazenove has never seen the pages of his predecessor in biographical portraiture. But on one point we must protest. The present Lecture attempts to win more favour for Strafford by casting slights upon the memory of Laud. Now this is a kind of defence which Strafford himself would not for one moment have endured. Whatever his faults, he was too generous and too fair ever to have attempted to sever his cause from that of the friend with whom he corresponded so playfully and affectionately during life, whose farewell blessing he sought at the very moment before his death. Mr. A. Cazenove terms Laud 'a great little man.' We are not concerned to defend all the Archbishop's acts, nor to approve of all the means employed by him (though the use of those means is in great part attributable to the times in which he lived), but assuredly no 'great little man' ever earned such undying hatred. It is something beyond littleness that ever makes any man's name realize in after years the description of Manzoni:—

'Segno d' immensa invidia,
E di pietà profonda,
D' inestinguibil odio,
E d' indomato amor.'

We are likewise informed by the Lecturer, that Strafford succeeded while Laud failed. The justice of such an assertion depends upon the sense which we attach to the terms *success* and *failure*. In one sense both failed: both saw the cause for which they contended sinking; both were condemned and lost their heads. But if we are to judge of their comparative success by their abiding influence, then no assertion can possibly be more untrue than that advanced by Mr. A. Cazenove. Strafford struggled and died, mainly, though not solely, for the maintenance of an all but absolute monarchy. Laud struggled and died that his beloved University might be something different from that of Halle or Wittenberg, and that the Church of England might be something different from the Arianizing communions of Holland or Geneva. The kind of monarchy for which Strafford contended has long since vanished; the University and Church for which Laud contended still live and energise in a way that, humanly speaking, would have been impossible, but for the work that he achieved. An ardent and highly gifted supporter of the Oxford Commission said to us, on its appointment, that he hoped to see the University swept clear of the traces of Laud; 'and yet,' he added, his natural candour overcoming

every other feeling, 'what a man he *must* have been, to have left such an impress there !' Readers of attacks upon his memory would do well to turn to the last chapter of Mr. Le Bas' 'Life of the Archbishop,' and to the short note appended by the poet Wordsworth to his sonnet upon Laud, a sonnet surpassed, however, in our judgment, by that fine apostrophe in 'The Cathedral':—

- 'Thy spirit in thee strove
To cleanse and set in beauty free
The ancient shrines, mindful of Him whose love
Swept with the scourge His Father's sanctuary.
- 'Thy cloke was burning zeal,
Untaught the worldling's arts to wield,
But Innocence thy coat of triple steel,
And Loyalty and Truth thy sword and shield.
- 'Thus arm'd against the tomb,
Thy dauntless course bore on to bind
Thy dying brows with deathless martyrdom,
Unsought by the true soul, but undeclin'd.'

Three years ago we called attention to the series of Lent Lectures annually delivered at Bristol, in one or other of the city churches. In 1857, the Bishop of the diocese declined having anything to do with these Lectures. We were not at all afraid that this would have any effect in diminishing the attendance either of clergy or laity at these services. We are glad to see that they have still gone on ; and this we believe is the thirteenth year of their continuance. With all the drawbacks which Bristol has experienced from its contiguity to Clifton, which has an unenviable notoriety from the ignorance and bigoted party spirit of its clergy, we believe it is the only place in England where sermons are preached on every day through the holy season. The list of preachers announced for this year certainly has surprised us, as it contains two or three names usually identified with the Latitudinarian and Evangelical parties. Their appearance, however, is honourable to those who have given them, as it shows a desire to promote a good work at the risk of being accused of inconsistency. We trust the usual Catholic tone of these Lectures has not been lowered to meet any foolish attempts at compromise or comprehension. If no such result has issued from the attempt, the Vicar of All Saints' may be congratulated on the success of a dangerous experiment.

'The Life of David, King of Israel,' (Macmillan & Co.) by the Rev. C. Josiah Wright, Head Master of Sutton Coldfield Grammar School, is a useful contribution in its way to the class of books for the young, having been originally framed as school lectures. Older persons, too, who may desire a more connected and elaborated narrative than they can make out for themselves from Holy Scripture, will be interested. Without much pretension to originality, Mr. Wright has used judiciously for his purpose the larger works of Stanley, Ewald, &c. He avoids two or three faults only too common in books of this kind: he does not presume to draw too largely on his own imagination to complete the details of the picture ; his moral

is not impertinently obtruded, nor is he betrayed into special pleading from a timid wish to explain away any apparent difficulties. His tone is thoughtful and reverent always. If less racy than Bishop Hall's quaint Contemplations, he is free from the uncouthness and at times absurdity which disfigure the old Bishop of Norwich's writings. Mr. Wright's style is clear and forcible; rather too ambitious, perhaps, for the calibre of his book, and too unvaryingly sustained; and the peculiar diction of Holy Scripture is sometimes dovetailed rather incongruously into modern English. Why does Mr. Wright follow the unreasonable fashion of quoting from the *Bible* version of the Psalms, comparatively unfamiliar as it is to our ears? The little book is prettily got up, and illustrated with some of Schnorr's Bible pictures, and altogether looks like a gift-book.

Mr. Parker's 'Historical Tales' are very beautiful, and perhaps the most beautiful is 'The Quay of the Dioscuri;' but there is no reason whatever why *truth*, historical truth, on subjects of the greatest theological importance, should be ignored, and so ignored, that in any other case than that of the author, we should have suspected, what is here not to be thought of, imperfect acquaintance with history. In doctrines, a most salient point is the teaching of Arius. Now, at p. 27, S. Athanasius is made to say, that Arius 'plainly and in so many words says that our Lord is a mere man, excellent, &c. . . . but a man still.' And Arius himself, p. 47, says, 'The Emperor esteems this a question of no importance, whether our Lord is . . . or pure man.' whereas the merest tyro in ecclesiastical history knows that Arius' teaching went on the doctrine that our Lord was a quasi-Divine being, existing before the world, by whom the world was made, who yet was created, and once did not exist, and was not of one substance with the Father, but was the creator of men and angels. At p. 76, Hosius, Bishop of Corduba, who presided in the Nicene Council, is represented as the legate of the Bishop of Rome. This is a statement altogether destitute of any contemporary authority, and irreconcilable with the statement that Vito and Vincentius were the representatives of the Bishop of Rome. At the close of the story, the death of Arius is represented as having taken place in 'a chemist's shop.' It took place notoriously in an edifice erected for public use. The spot was well known and avoided till the building itself was pulled down to remove the monument of the awful occurrence. As Gibbon has said that 'those who press the literal 'narrative of the death of Arius, must make their option between *poison* and a *miracle*,' there seems no reason to give the young reader the prejudice in favour of poison, which a death in 'a chemist's shop' might suggest. The story *gains nothing* by the departures from truth, and the tales if not written with more care must be called the *unhistorical*.

In our article (July, 1859) on 'Primates and Metropolitans,' we stated, by a mere slip of the pen, that the Chapter, as well as the Bishop, of Natal, had sanctioned polygamy in the converts. Nothing was farther from our intention; for we knew that the Prelate in question was alone responsible: and we are sincerely sorry to have imputed such a decision to the Canons.

INDEX TO VOL. XXXIX.

(NEW SERIES.)

ARTICLES AND SUBJECTS.

A.

Ambrosian Liturgy, the [*Missale Ambrosianum*, &c.], 135—165.

B.

Babylonian Literature [*Chwolson* on], 417—454.

Bacon and the Inductive Philosophy [*Bacon's Essays*, &c.], 239—263.

Brechin, Bishop of [*Trial of*, &c.], 474—478.

C.

Church Cause and Church Party [*Reports of London Church Union*, &c.], 80—134.

L.

Liturgical Quotations in S. Paul's Epistles [*Daniel's Codex*, &c.], 479—491.

M.

Mansel and Maurice, Messrs. [*What is Revelation?* &c.], 283—312.

N.

Neale's Commentary on the Psalms, 264—283.

O.

Oxford, Bishop's Ordination Addresses, 454—474.

NO. CVIII.—N.S.

P.

Paris Life, Realities of [*Flemish Interiors*, &c.], 177—208.

Prayer-book, Revision of [*Journal of Convocation*, &c.], 208—229.

Q.

Quakerism, Young [*Rowntree's Prize Essay*], 1—47.

R.

Revivalism, Irish [*Oulton on Ulster Revival*, &c.], 364—416.

U.

L'Union Chrétienne [*Journal*, &c.], 166—176.

V.

Virginia [*Massachusetts Historical Society*, &c.], 48—79.

W.

Wilson, Daniel [*Bateman's Life of Bishop Daniel Wilson*, &c.], 313—363.

K K

SHORTER NOTICES OF BOOKS AND PAMPHLETS.

JANUARY—Prospectus and Publications of the 'Marriage Law Defence Association'—Athanasius and other Poems, by a Fellow of a College—Readings on the History of Joseph and his Brethren—Freeman's Advent Sermons—Poems and Pictures—James Montgomery's Poems—Tennyson's Princess—Cats' Moral Emblems—Dr. Wordsworth's new edition of Park's Life of Mr. Stevens, sometime Treasurer to Queen Anne's Bounty—Todd's Harvest-home Sermon, The Feast—Aggesden Vicarage—Major Bolton's Revival Movement—Heilbroun's Short Tract for Revivalists—The Second Coming of

Christ—Neale's Translation of the Liturgies of S. Mark, S. James, S. Clement, S. Chrysostom, and the Church of Malabar—Webb's History of Sheen—Leitch's Translation of Wiltich's Geography and Statistics of the Church.

APRIL—Rev. Arthur Cazenove's Lecture on Lord Strafford—The Bristol Lent Lectures—The Life of David, King of Israel, by the Rev. C. Josiah Wright, Head Master of Sutton Coldfield Grammar School—Mr. Parker's Historical Tales.



